

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

VOL. III.

PUBLISHED IN

JULY & OCTOBER 1837.



LONDON:

WILLIAM SPOONER, 377, STRAND;
M. STAUNTON, 80, MARLBOROUGH STREET, DUBLIN,
AGENT FOR IRELAND & WALES, EDINBURGH:
JAMES STUART AND CO. GLASGOW.



LONDON: O. RICHARDS, PRINTER, 100, ST. MARTIN'S LANE, CHURCH CROSS.

CONTENTS

OF

No. VII.

Art.	Page
I.—Storia di Corsica da Filipum, rivista e pubblicata da 1. C. Gregori. App. famiglia Pozzo di Borgo. Milan. G835 - - - - -	1
II.—1. Die Religion der Römer nach den Quellen dargestellt von F. A. Hartung. The Religion of the Romans sketched from its Sources. By F. A. Hartung. 2 vols. 8vo. Erlangen, 1836. - - - - -	
2. R. H. Klausen, Phil. Dris. in universitate Fridericia Wil- helmsia Rhenana Professoris publici, de Carmine Fratrum Arvalium liber ad patrem Theoph. Ern. Klausen cett. solemniter expleti per quinquaginta annos muneris cele- brantem. 8vo. Bonnæ, 1836. - - - - -	
3. Rudimenta Linguae Umbricae ex Inscriptionibus antiquis enodata. Scripsit Dr. G. F. Grotefend, Lycæi Hanno- verani Director. IV. Particulas. 4to. Hannoveræ. 1835-1837 - - - - -	
4. De Morum in Virgillii Æneide habitu, Scripsit. Dr. Laurentius Lersch, 8vo. Bonnæ. 1836 - - - - -	
5. De Originibus historiæ Romanæ seu de antiquissimis carminibus historicis, de legibus regiis atque de com- mentariis regum scripsit Christianus Petersen, Ph. Dr. et Philologiæ classicæ Prof. publ. in Gymnasio Ham- burgensium academico. 4to. Hamburgi, 1835 - - - - -	
6. Jus Pontificium der Römer. Von K. D. Hullmann. 8vo. Bonn. 1836 - - - - -	
7. Über Begriff und Wesen der römischen Omen and über dessen Beziehung zum Privatrechte. Von Joh. Fallati, Doctor der Rechte. On the Notion and Nature of the Roman Omen, and its reference to law. By F. Fallati, Doctor in Law. 8vo. Tübingen. 1836. - - - - -	
8. Grundlinien zur Geschichte der Verfalls der römischen Staatsreligion bis auf die Zeit des August. Eine liter- arhistorische Abhandlung, von Dr. Leopold Krahner. Historical Outline of the Decline of the Public Religion of Rome down to the time of Augustus. A Treatise for Literary History, by Dr. L. Krahner. (A Pro- gramme of the Principal Latin School at Halle, pub- lished by Dr. M. Schmidt, Rector of the same, 16th March 1837). 4to. Halle. 1837 - - - - -	33

ART.	Page
III.—1. England and America : a Comparison of the Social and Political State of both Nations. 2 vols. 1833	-
2. Report from the Select Committee (of the House of Commons) on the Disposal of Land in the Colonies; with Minutes of Evidence and Appendix. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, August 20th, 1836	-
3. The First Step to a Poor Law for Ireland. By H. G. Ward, Esq. M.P. 1837	-
4. First Annual Report of the Colonization Commissioners for South-Australia. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 25th July, 1836	-
5. The New Zealanders. Library of Entertaining Knowledge.	-
6. The British Colonization of New Zealand: being an account of the principles, objects, and plans, of the New Zealand Association. (Published for the New Zealand Association.) 32mo. 1837	-
IV.—Premier Mémoire sur les Antiquités Chrétiennes,—Peintures des Catacombs. Par M. Raoul Rochette.—Extrait du Tome xiii des Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres. 4to. Paris. 1836	63
V.—1. La Chanson de Roland, ou de Roncevaux, du xii Siècle. Publiée pour la première fois, d'après le manuscrit de la Bibliothèque Bodleienne, à Oxford, par Francisque Michel. 8vo. Paris. 1837.	96
2. Roman de la Violette; ou, de Gerard de Nevers, en vers du xiii Siècle. Par Gibert de Montreuil. Publié pour la première fois d'après deux manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Royale Par Francisque Michel. 8vo. Paris. 1834. &c. &c. &c.	105
VI.—An Introduction to the Scientific Labours of the Nineteenth Century. By Henri de St. Simon. 2 vols. Paris. 1808.	138
VII.—1. The French in Africa, 8vo. pp. 50.	-
2. Correspondence with His Majesty's Ambassador at Paris, and Communications from the French Ambassador in London, relative to the French expedition against Algiers—	179
• VIII.—Quelques Considérations pour servir à l'Histoire du Magnétisme Animale. Par A. Fillasier. Paris. 1832. &c.	202
IX.—The Allocution of His Holiness Pope Gregory XVI, addressed to the Consistory of Rome, 10th Dec. 1837	232
X.—Speech of the Earl of Mulgrave in the House of Lords, on Monday, 27th of November, 1837, on the Motion of the Earl of Roden for certain Papers, referring to the State of Ireland	246

CONTENTS

No. V.

ART.

Page

- I.—*La Mimica degli Antichi investigata nel Gestire Napolitano.* The Gestures of the Ancients sought in the Gesticulations of the Neapolitans. By the Canon Andrea de Jorio. Naples. 1832. - - - 1
- II.—1 *History of Ireland.* By Thomas Moore, Esq. London. 1835.
2. *History of Ireland, from the Invasion under Henry II. to its Union with Great Britain.* By Francis Plowden. New Edition. London. 1831.
3. *History of Ireland, from the earliest period to the year 1814.* By Stephen Barlow, A.M.
4. *Inland Navigation, &c. of Ireland.* By C. W. Williams, Esq. Second Edition. Dublin. 1833.
5. *Report of Commissioners of Shannon Navigation, 1836.*
6. *Report of Committee of the House of Commons on Light-houses. 1834.*
7. *Return to an Order of the House of Commons for Evidence before Revenue Commissioners relative to Irish Western Harbours. 1834.*
8. *Other Parliamentary Documents.* - - - 15
- III.—1. *Primitive Tradition recognised in Holy Scripture, a Sermon preached in the Cathedral Church of Winchester, at the Visitation of the Most Worshipful and Rev. W. Dealtry, D.D. Chancellor of the Diocese, September 27, 1836.* By the Rev. John Keble, M.A. Second Edition. London. Rivingtons. 1837.
2. *The British Critic, No. XL. (Oct. 1836.)* - - - 43
- IV.—1. *Report on the Civil Government of Canada, 1828.*
2. *Petition of the House of Assembly of Lower Canada for a Redress of Grievances. March, 1834.*
3. *Petition (the Second) from the Assembly of Lower Canada. December, 1834. With explanatory Remarks (by H. S. Chapman). March, 1835.*
4. *Existing Difficulties of the Government of the Canadas.* By J. A. Roebuck, M.P. 1836.
5. *The last Session of the Provincial Parliament of Lower Canada, By E. B. O'Callaghan, M.P. April, 1836.*
6. *Petition (the Third) from the House of Assembly of Lower Canada. 1836.*
7. *Seventh Report of the Committee on Grievances (Upper Canada.) Toronto. 1835.*
8. *Canadians; or, Sketches of Upper Canada: and the Political Crisis.* By W. B. Wells, Esq. Member of the Parliament of U.C. 1837.
9. *Reports of the Commissioners to Lower Canada. 1837.*
10. *The "Times" Newspaper of the 7th and 9th of March, and April 15th. "Debates on Canada."* - - - 79
- V.—*Londres: Voyage contenant la Description de cette Capitale, avec les Mœurs, &c. &c. par Albert Montémont. Paris.* - - - 143

VI.—First Report of the Commissioners of Inquiry into the State of the Irish Fisheries, with the Minutes of Evidence and Appendix. Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of His Majesty. Dublin. 1836.	133
VII.—Mémoire sur la Détermination de l'Echelle du Thermomètre de l'Académie del Cimento: par M. G. Libri. Annales de Chimie et de Physique: par MM. Gay-Lussac et Arago. Vol. XLV.	151
VIII.—Christian Political Economy; or, an Examination into the Causes of Pauperism as it exists in France and Europe, and of the Means of Relieving and Preventing it. By the Viscount Villeneuve Bargimon, Prefect of the North, formerly Counsellor of State, Deputy, &c. 3 vols. Paris. 1834.	166
IX.—1. Descent of the Danube, from Ratisbon to Vienna, during the Autumn of 1827, with anecdotes and recollections, &c. By J. R. Planché, author of "Lays and Legends of the Rhine," "Oberon," an Opera, &c. 8vo. London. 1828.	
2. A Steam Voyage down the Danube, with Sketches of Hungary, Wallachia, Servia, Turkey, &c. By Michael J. Quin, Author of "A Visit to Spain." Third edition, with additions. In two volumes. Post 8vo. London. 1836.	
3. Austria and the Austrians. In two volumes, Post 8vo. London. 1837.	
4. Three Voyages in the Black Sea to the coast of Circassia. By the Chev. Taitbout de Marigny, Consul of His Majesty the King of the Netherlands, at Odessa. 8vo. London. 1837.	
5. Travels in Circassia, Krim Tartary, &c. including a Steam Voyage down the Danube, from Vienna to Constantinople, and round the Black Sea, in 1836. By Edmund Spencer, Esq. Author of "Sketches of Germany and the Germans," &c. In two volumes. 8vo. London. 1837.	
6. Report on the Commerce of the Ports of New Russia, Moldavia, and Wallachia, made to the Russian Government, in 1835, in pursuance of an investigation, undertaken by order of Count Woronzow. Translated from the original, published at Odessa, by T. F. Triebner. Post 8vo. London. 1836.	
7. A Geographical, Statistical, and Commercial Account of the Russian Ports of the Black Sea, the Sea of Azoph, and the Danube; also an official Report of the European Commerce of Russia, in 1835. From the German. With a map. 8vo. London. 1837.	198
X.—Théorie Analytique des Probabilités. Par M. le Marquis de Laplace, &c. Sième édition. Paris. 1820.	237
XI.—Summary Review of Italian and German Catholic Literature, from January to June 1837.	249
Miscellaneous Intelligence	253
Notices of New Books	267

CONTENTS

OF

No. VI.

ART.	Page
I.—Novalis Schriften. Herausgegeben von L. Tieck und F. Schlegel. Berlin. 1826.—The Writings of Novalis. Edited by L. Tieck and F. Schlegel. Berlin. 1826. 4th Edition. - - - - -	277
II —Deux Chanceliers d'Angleterre. Bacon de Vérulam et S. Thomas de Canterbéry. Par A. F. Ozanam. Paris. 1836. - - - - -	305
III.—1. Geschichte der Vorläufer der Reformation. History of the Forerunners of the Reformation. By Dr. Ludwig Flathe. Leipsig. 1835.	
2. Histoire des Vaudois des Vallées du Piémont. Par A. Muston. Paris. 1834.	
3. Considérations sur les Vaudois. Par M. Peyran.	
4. Recherches Historiques sur la véritable Origine des Vaudois, et sur le Caractère de leurs Doctrines Primitives. Paris. 1836. - - - - -	325
IV.—1. Contrasts, or a Parallel between the Noble Edifices of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries, and similar Buildings of the Present Day; shewing the present decay of Taste. By A. Welby Pugin, architect. 4to. Lond. 1836.	
2. A Reply to Observations which appeared in "Fraser's Magazine" for March 1837, on a work entitled "Contrasts." By the Author of that Publication. 8vo. London. 1837. - - - - -	360
V.—Histoire de Sainte Elizabeth de Hongrie, Duchesse de Thuringe. (1207-1231.) Par Le Comte de Montalembert, Pair de France. Paris. 1836. - - - - -	384
VI.—1. The Angler in Ireland, or an Englishman's Ramble through Connaught and Munster, in the Summer of 1833. London. 1834.	
2. Journey throughout Ireland, in the Spring, Summer, and Autumn of 1834. By H. D. Inglis, Esq. Lond. 1835.	
3. A Tour round Ireland in the Summer of 1835. By John Barrow, Junr. Esq. London, 1836 - - - - -	401

VII.—1.	Letters from an Irish Protestant to the People of Scotland. 1836.	
2.	Blackwood's Magazine	- 428
VIII.—1.	Annual Reports of the Agent for Emigrants at Quebec, printed by order of the House of Commons, 1831 to 1836.	
2.	New York Shipping and Passenger Returns, 1826 to 1836.	- 452
IX.—1.	A Christian Peace Offering; being an Endeavour to abate the Asperities of the Controversy between the Roman and English Catholic Churches. By the Hon. Arthur Philip Perceval, B.C.L., Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majesty, Rector of East Horseley, and late Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford. 1829.	
2.	The Roman Schism Illustrated, from the Records of the Catholic Church. By the Hon. and Rev. A. P. Perceval, B.C.L. 1836.	- 468
X.—1.	Animal and Vegetable Physiology, considered with reference to Natural Theology. By Dr. Roget	
2.	Letters on Natural Magic. By Sir David Brewster	- 525
XI.—	Summary Review of French Catholic Literature, from March to September 1837.	- 550
	Miscellaneous Intelligence	- 557



THE
DUBLIN REVIEW

JULY 1837.

ART. I.—*La Mimica degli Antichi investigata nel Gestire Napolitano. The Gestures of the Ancients sought in the Gesticulations of the Neapolitans.* By the Canon Andrea de Jorio. Naples. 1832.

WHEN Italians converse, it is not the tongue alone that has full occupation; their words are sure to have an instrumental accompaniment, in the gestures of their bodies. You never see, among them, two gentlemen standing bolt upright, one with his hands behind his back, and the other leaning on his umbrella, while they resolve to oppose a bill in Parliament, or to file one in Chancery, or determine to protest one in the city. You never see an orator, sacred or profane, screwed down in the middle of his pulpit, or wedged between the benches of his court, or holding hard on the front of his hustings, as though afraid of being run away with by his honourable pillory, and pouring forth impassioned eloquence, with a statue-like stillness of limbs, unless the right arm escape, to move up and down with the regularity of a pump-handle, or inflict, from time to time, a clenching blow upon the subjacent boards. No, it is not so in Italy. Let two friends sit down to solace themselves at the door of a *café*, in the cool of a summer's evening, or let them walk together along the noisy street of Toledo, at Naples; let their conversation be upon the merest trifle, the present opera, the last festival, or the next marriage, and each speaker, as he utters his opinion in flowing musical sounds, will be seen to move his fingers, his hands, and his entire body, with a variety of gestures, attuned in perfect cadence to the emphasis of his words. See, one of them now is not actually speaking, though the other has ceased; but he has raised his right hand, keeping the points of the thumb and index joined, and the other fingers expanded, and has laid his left gently upon his companion's arm. Depend upon it, his reply is going to open with a sententious saw, some magnificent truism, from which he will draw marvellous consequences. His mouth will open slowly,

ere it yields a sound ; and when at last ‘ Sir Oracle ’ speaks, the right hand will beat time, by rising and falling on each substantive and verb of the sentence ; and at its close, the two wedded fingers will fly apart, and the entire expanded hand, waive with grace and dignity outwards, if the propositions be positive. If negative, the fore-finger alone will remain extended, and erect, and be slowly moved backwards and forwards between the interlocutors’ faces. When the solemn sentence has been pronounced, and enforced by a dignified toss of the head, it is the other’s turn. But the *dictum* was probably too vague and general to receive a specific reply ; and, therefore, reserving his opinion till he has better felt his way, he shakes his head and hands, uttering, you may depend upon it, the monosyllabic but polysemous exclamation “ Eh ! ” which, like a Chinese word, receives its meaning from its varying accent. The active speaker perceives that he has not carried the outworks of his friend’s conviction, and addresses himself to a stronger attack. He now assumes the gesture of earnest remonstrance ; his two hands are joined palm to palm, with the thumbs depressed, and the fingers closely glued together, (for were the former erect, and the little fingers detached, and especially were they moved up and down, the gesture would signify not to *pray* but to *bray*, being the hieroglyphic for a donkey ;) and in this position they beat time, moving up and down, while the head is thrown back upon the right shoulder. We can hear the very words too here ; they begin for certain with “ *abbie pazienze*, ”* a reproachful expostulation ; after which follows a more energetic repetition, slightly varied of what had been previously urged ; and, as the sentence closes, the hands are separated, and fly apart. If the point is not carried, the reasoning is enforced by a more personal appeal. All the fingers of the right hand are joined together with the thumb, and their united points are pressed upon the forehead, which bends forward towards the unconvinced and incredulous listener, while a new form is given to the argument. This gesture is a direct appeal to the common sense of the other party ; it is like intimating, that, if he have brains he must understand the reasoning. Further obstinacy would lead to altercation, and assent is yielded by a slow shrug, with the head inclined, and the hands separately raised, the palms turned downwards. “ *E vero*, ” “ *ha ragione*, ” or “ *non si può negare*, ”† are doubtless the accompanying words.

All this is a quiet, friendly scene : and, indeed, there are one

* “ Bear with me,” literally—“ have patience.”

† “ It is true—you are right—it is undeniable.”

or two more degrees of intensity of expostulation, and energy of gesture, which might be used, but which we pass over for fear of becoming tedious. But when the topic of conversation is more exciting, and the feelings of the speakers are more interested, gesture succeeds gesture with wonderful rapidity, and with bolder action; the head and trunk shake and writhe sympathetically with the agitation of the limbs, and long before an angry feeling has been expressed, a stranger fancies that they are in a towering passion, and considers their motions as the senseless and unmeaning convulsions of two madmen. Now, all the time not a finger is moved, not a shoulder shrugged, not a lip compressed or curled, but by rule; that is, without its having a determinate, invariable signification.

The book before us undertakes to classify and describe these various gesticulations, with reference to the Neapolitans in particular. But our observation has satisfied us, that with few exceptions, they may be considered the conventional language of all Italy. We have found them every where but little varied; and in compensation for such as may be peculiar to Naples, we have noticed several, omitted by the learned and amiable author, but common in other parts. The Canonico De Jorio is well known to most of our countrymen who have visited Naples, as much by the cheerful courtesy, which his knowledge of our language enables him to exercise towards them, as by his learned works upon the antiquities of that city and its vicinity. The present work is drawn up in alphabetical order, and gives the different gestures by which every passion, feeling, and idea, is ordinarily expressed. Considered simply in this light, it is an amusing work to any one sufficiently conversant with Italian manners. But its title suggests that it has a higher aim, and attempts to trace in these modern signs the action of the ancients. In fact, almost every gesture described by the classic authors remains yet in use, with the same signification. But the learned author has sought in this conformity between ancient and modern Italians the explanations of mute monuments, on which the relative positions and feelings of the figures represented can only be conjectured from the action which they use. Having established that in general the same gestures have always expressed the same idea, he examines under what feelings the action represented would now be used, and thus decides its meaning on the monument.

These remarks naturally suggest an interesting question,—to what are we to attribute this resemblance between the ancients and moderns? Were these expressive and almost speaking gestures originally invented, and then perpetuated to our times,

or are they the result of a natural connexion between them and the ideas they represent? Are they, in other words, conventional or instructive? To this we reply, that they are manifestly of both characters. Some are doubtless of the latter class—such as striking the forehead in disappointment, or pressing the heart in protestation of sincerity or affection. Others are clearly artificial, such as the expression of “to-morrow,” by a semicircle formed in the air by the fore finger drawn from below upwards. This sign represents a diurnal revolution of the sun, to be completed before the event alluded to takes place. Even here, therefore, we have a clear reason for the symbol; and it is not difficult to discover one in every other instance. In order to ascertain it, we must observe that these gestures primarily are used with words, and form the usual accompaniment of certain phrases. For these, the gestures become substitutes, and by association express all their meaning, even when used alone. Again, these phrases are often metaphorical, and the gesture represents their literal meaning; and thus becomes, when applied to the figurative, a real metonymy. A few examples will illustrate this observation.

Hunger is expressed by beating the ribs with the flat of the hands. This signifies that the sides meet, or are weak from want of something between them. But hunger is a child of poverty; and hence the parent comes to be represented by the same sign. The connexion between the organ of smelling and sagacity is traceable in this latter word, which literally signifies the power of following objects by the scent, as hounds do. The ancients expressed the want of acuteness, or the infliction of a hoax, by reference to the nose,—“suspendere naso,” to hang by the nose, is a common phrase in their writings. This connexion of ideas, real or imaginary, is expressed amongst us, and in Germany, in the same manner as in Italy. The thumb applied to the side of the nose, with the hand extended, indicates, as Cruikshanks well knows, that the party aimed at is little better than a goose. With us, however, the action has no corresponding phrase from which its signification can have been drawn. This is to be found in Italian, in which even good writers express the idea “he was tricked or deceived,” by “*e restato con un palmo di naso*,” “he was left with a palm’s length of nose.” It is manifestly this idea that is expressed by the gesture, which literally describes it, and then follows it in its metaphorical acceptation. The Canonico De Jorio supposes the expression to have arisen from the manner in which the face is thrust forward, with a gaping mouth and staring eyes, (illustrative characteristics never omitted with the gesture) when a hoax

is discovered (p. 72). Any caricature of cockney sportsmen will suggest a more natural explanation, from the simpleton expression which the countenance has, when its middle part protrudes excessively.

But the same useful organ gives rise to another similar figure. Suspicion is expressed, and you are put upon your guard against a person, by the fore-finger of the right hand being placed upon the side of the nose. If you inquire about a person's principles, and are answered, as we remember to have been, by this action, you understand that he, "is tainted, not sound:" and the corresponding Italian word "*puzze*," expresses the meaning. On one occasion, when in Italy, we were drawn into a species of altercation by a person who was generally known to be tiresome and fond of dispute. We were not aware of this trait in his otherwise estimable character; but a friend who saw us getting entangled, walked to and fro before us, but behind the other contending party, making this sign, as though with no particular object. We understood the hint, drew off our forces, and beat a retreat as quickly as possible.

We have seen how the passive participation in a deceit is described; the active voice has also its expression corresponding to an idiomatic sound. To convey the idea that an individual is deceiving you, a friend will simply place his fingers between his cravat and his neck, and rub the latter slowly with the back of his hand. In the Neapolitan dialect the expression is "*l'a menata dinto allo cravattino*," or "*ncanna*;" "he has put it within his cravat," or "down his throat." The expression corresponds to our terms *to cram* and *to swallow*; and the gesture represents, most practically, the enlargement of the oesophagus necessary for conveying the deceit down the patient's throat. Hence, another symbol of the same idea consists in opening the mouth, and pretending to throw something into it from the united fingers of the right hand.

Almost every gesture may thus be traced to some proverbial or idiomatic phrase,—as several other instances in the course of this paper will show. It is indeed necessary sometimes to travel through a long chain of ideas to comprehend a sign. Let us suppose a youth at a window, invited by one in the street to come down and walk, by a beckoning,—not as amongst us with the fingers upwards, which would only mean salutation, but with them turned downwards, and repeatedly moved towards the palm. He answers by placing his hand, with all the fingers apart, before his face. What does this mean? Why, he thus represents himself as looking through the barred window of a prison, and so communicates to his friend that domestic autho-

rity confines him to the house. In the neighbourhood of Naples, your carriage is sure to be followed by a covey of brats, who, well aware that you probably do not understand their slang, trust much more to the graphic language of gesture to excite your pity. For this purpose, they dispose their fore-finger and thumb in the form of a horse-shoe, and apply their points first vertically above and below the mouth, and then horizontally to its corners, alternating the movement with great rapidity. Unfortunately, the ludicrous woe-begone expression of face which accompanies the action, usually destroys its intended pathos, and prevents even an acute observer from penetrating its poetry. It signifies that the mouth has been cross-barred or sealed up; in other words, that the sufferer has had nothing to eat for a long time.

We remember observing a remarkable instance of quickness in the application of a symbol to a complicated idea, in a ragged little boy at Genoa, whose perseverance in mendicant supplication was rewarded by an Englishman with a *crazia*, a miserable copperfoil coin, half as thin and half as large as a wafer. An English beggar would have, perhaps, at once given vent to his indignation by throwing it on the ground; not so the little Italian. He placed the coin deliberately on the palm of his hand, brought it to the level of his mouth, and, with a roguish look at the giver, blew it away by a sharp puff upon the ground. To blow towards a person or thing is a strong expression of contempt; * so that additional emphasis was given to the less refined mode of rejecting with disdain. But, at the same time, the action substantiated its own motive: the urchin most scientifically proved the cause of his discontent,—the *lightness* of the present. We believe it had a still better quality; it drew a larger coin out of the amused gentleman's pocket.

To illustrate the extent to which this method of expressing ideas may be carried, we may imagine a question, and see how many ways it may be answered. Suppose, for instance, that we wish to ask after the health of one who lies sick in the next room. The attendant's finger pressed upon the lips indicates the necessity of preserving silence. Well, a toss back of the head, with enquiring eyes, and turning towards the door of the room, sufficiently asks the question, "How is he?" The servant stretches out his hand, with the palm downwards, and the fingers slightly apart, and shakes it from side to side. This means "*cose, cose*," "so, so." If he moved it more, so as to describe a curve in the air, by turning it at the wrist, the signifi-

* De Jorio, p. 129.

cation would be "*alti e bassi*," "ups and downs," that the patient's state varies considerably from time to time. A shake of the head with a smack of the lips, or with a certain indescribable guttural groan, would indicate that he is very ill: both the hands raised, and, as well as the head, agitated from side to side, would denote that there was no hope. If the movement of both were upwards, it would signify a great improvement. In these gestures, however, the expression of countenance, and especially the eyes, would play an important part. Suppose the assistant to place his cheek reclining upon his right hand, with his left under the right elbow, he thereby tells you that the patient sleeps. If he raises his little finger, pointing upwards, and says, "He is thus," you understand that he is reduced to a skeleton. When at length he answers your enquiry by cutting the air with his hand in the form of a cross, you know at once that further enquiries are useless; their object is no more. And this sign metaphorically expresses the end of a project, the failure of a "concern," the loss of a lawsuit, or any other termination of sublunary affairs.

Ask, now, for example, the character of a man with whom you have to deal, and, suppose your adviser to prefer answering by signs:—if he place his finger on his forehead, he tells you that he is a man of sense; if he press his thumb against his temple, leaving the open hand to stretch forward from the side of his face, he indicates his affinity to the long-eared race. If, with his forefinger, he draw down the outer corner of his eye, he intimates that he is a cunning rogue, with whom you must be upon your guard; literally, that he squints, and you can never be sure which way he looks. To denote that he is an honest and upright man, he will stretch out his hand steadily, joining the tips of his thumb and forefinger, as if holding by them scales nicely balanced. If, on the other hand, he hook together the little fingers of both hands, and move these forward, swerving from side to side, and shaking the other fingers, he means to inform you that he is like the crab, which his hands mimic, tortuous in his ways. The thumb pressing on the first joint of the forefinger, as if cutting it off, means that he is "only so large," a man of narrow ideas and little mind. The expressions for good or bad are more difficult to characterise, as they depend much upon the countenance. The negative shake of the finger, with a face expressive of aversion, will mean the latter; the hand thrown upwards, and the head back, with a prolonged "Ah!" the former. If you ask what is become of one whom you have not seen for some time, you may be answered without a word, should the truth be disagreeable. The

head placed forward, with the little finger towards the earth, and so moved up and down, signifies that he is gone away; and the frequency and deliberation of repetition denotes proportionably greater distance. But if the hand, instead of being before the breast, be brought round to the left side, and so make the motion edgeways, directed behind the speaker, it means that he has run away stealthily and escaped. If, placed before, it descend smartly and obliquely, as if cutting something, towards the left side, the meaning is, that he has been punished in some way: if the fists be clenched, and the two wrists crossed over one another, you understand that he is in prison.

We will only put one more case, which concerns the most engrossing of all conversational topics,—money. You will ask if a man be rich or not by an enquiring glance and nod towards him, at the same time that you strike your pocket, or rub the points of finger and thumb, as though counting out money. Your silent friend, by the proper nods, looks, and motions of the hands, tells you “no,” or “so, so,” or “exceedingly,” which last is expressed by a toss of the hand and head, and a half sort of whistle, or something between that and a hiss. Well, suppose the latter; you ask, by word or by look, how he has become so. Your informant, with his thumb, rubs his forehead from side to side, to signify that it was by the sweat of his brow, his industry and application. But perhaps, he does not raise his hand so high, but takes hold of his cheek between his thumb and closed fingers, shaking the hand. That informs you, that he has made his fortune by bribery and peculation. He may come lower still, and, doubling up his hand, put his thumb, bent like a hook, under his chin; and you shall understand that he has taken advantage of others’ necessities for his profit, having placed a hook in their jaws. Or, the two clenched fists are pressed strongly upon the chest, which means that he has been avaricious, or, analogously to the action, “*close-fisted*.” In fine, the fingers are drawn in and closed, beginning with the first, and so to the last, making a species of curve, and the signification is, by theft and robbery. Should the answer have been unfavourable to the person’s pecuniary condition, and you enquire the reason, as he was known once to have been rich, the reply may be no less varied. For instance, your informant, joining all the fingers of one or both hands together, as he wishes to be more or less emphatic, brings their tips near his mouth, and then, blowing on them a long deliberate puff, with swelled cheeks, withdraws and throws them open, as though they were blown asunder and scattered by the breath. This naturally indicates that the fortune of which you asked has been dissipated

one hardly knows how, but by general inattention. Should he close up his fist, and, throwing back his head, point repeatedly with his extended thumb towards his mouth, he will assign drink as the sad cause. Should the same gesture be made with the united points of all the fingers and thumb, more solid extravagance, by eating, will be denoted. In fine, if, closing his left hand before his breast, as if holding something tight between its thumb and forefinger, he, with the same finger of the right equally shut, appear to draw that imaginary thing out with difficulty, the meaning is, that gambling has been the ruinous practice; for the action represents a trick which gamesters have in drawing out a card from their hand.

These examples are sufficient to prove how extensive, accurate, and useful this system of signs must be. It will be easily understood that every passion and its consequences,—love and hatred, pleasure and grief, menace and imitation, hope and despair,—has its graphic symbol, as have all the ordinary relations of things, time, space, and circumstance. There are, too, a thousand mimic signs, which are more purely imitative, which the occasion suggests and analogy assists to interpret; for the metaphorical gestures cannot be varied. In Naples, too, there is one class of them which we have omitted, because they would have led us aside into a curious and not unamusing, but certainly irrelevant subject, that of the belief in *Jettatura*, or the evil eye, of which these gestures are the counteracters.* It is evident that a people possessing a language literally at their fingers' ends, must express themselves with wonderful vivacity on all occasions, and possess a resource for communicating their ideas under many circumstances where speech is impossible, and where Englishmen must be silent, or spell words on their fingers by the alphabet of the deaf and dumb. A curious example occurred of this utility of gestures some years ago. When old Ferdinand, the darling of the Neapolitans, returned to his capital after the last foolish revolution, in 1822, he presented himself at a balcony to the assembled multitude of repentant and delighted *lazzaroni*. Neapolitans never speak, they always shout; and, in newspaper phrase, to obtain a hearing was, on this occasion, out of the question. The king, however, was a thorough Neapolitan, and understood the language of the fingers, if he did not that of flowers; so he made his address, for we cannot call it a speech, in it. He reproved them for their past naughtiness, he threatened them with greater severity if they again misbehaved, and, after exhorting them to good conduct,

* See De Jorio, p. 89, 120, 155-159.

ordered them to disperse and go home quietly. Every gesture was understood, without a word, amidst the most deafening sounds. Now, how useful would such an art be upon the hustings sometimes. We fancy we could easily compose a *manual* address to a boisterous constituency, in which, spite of all clamour from the rival party, we could express the usual routine and commonplace effusions of patriotism and zeal: could satisfactorily prove on our fingers that our competitor was unworthy of all confidence; and, with some aid from the nose and cheek, establish an undoubted claim to preference. A little sleight of hand would thus place the most asthmatic candidate on a level with the most stentorian demagogue.

But in Italy this dramatic system need not be taught, it is learnt spontaneously with the language. We have seen little girls of seven or eight repress the forwardness of a younger companion, with a dignity of attitude and correctness of action which would have become an Electra or a Lady Macbeth. Nay, we have been still more puzzled by seeing a blind man, the appearance of whose eyes convinced us that he had never enjoyed sight, make the very gestures which we have described, as correctly as if he had learnt them by imitation, and not by intuition. Often the gesture is not perfectly made but only indicated by approximating to the attitude it requires. It is thus better concealed from those who are not meant to perceive it, and forms a sort of *demotic* to the hieroglyphical expression in which the symbol is rather hinted than actually represented. But the part which the eye plays in this noiseless loquacity is most important, yet most indescribable. In Sicily, indeed, it is so powerful as to supersede all other means of communication; for long and complicated interviews may be carried on without any other aid. It is believed that the Sicilian Vespers were concerted, throughout the island, without the exchange of a syllable, and the day and hour for the indiscriminate massacre of the French fixed by interchanges of looks and perhaps a few signs. Thus we may say, that if the Italian communication by gesture is a species of telegraph, that of the Sicilians resembles more a system of signals by lights, equally complete, though more difficult to describe.

In discussing this subject we have drawn more upon our observation than upon the Canon's book, which, however, has ever been at our side, to form a corrective, when necessary, to our recollections. There is another part of his task in which we would gladly follow him more closely, did room permit: in the application of modern gesture to the illustration of ancient art. But we know not how we well could do this without copying his plates, which are almost necessary for fully understanding this

part of the subject.* Suffice it to say that his researches prove the system of action to have been identical in ancient and in modern Italy. The different positions of the hand described by Quintilian, Apuleius, and other classic authors, are yet in use; the figures painted in the celebrated Vatican Terence represent the very action which would now be employed with the words they utter; and the scenes on Greek vases, or reliefs, tell their own story to an eye practised in the mysterious language of gesture.

This, we apprehend, is enough to give some real interest to what we have treated in this article as matter of mere curiosity. For it must be as important to the antiquarian to decypher this symbolical speech, as the crabbed legend, over which he may pore for hours, till he fancies he has made a plausible conjecture. But there is another aspect under which this subject may be viewed, of still more general interest; we speak of its utility in understanding and appreciating later Italian art. On this point De Jorio has naturally said nothing, because it regards foreigners rather than his own countrymen, who understand it. We could easily give instances of this application of Italian gesture to works of art; we will content ourselves with one drawn from a real master-piece, the most *speaking* picture probably ever painted. Universally admired as Leonardo da Vinci's Last Supper is, one of its principal beauties will be overlooked if the action of the figures, as expressive of their words and sentiments, be not understood. Take, for instance, the figure of Judas. The gospel gives us two characteristics of him, that he was a thief, and carried a purse.* The latter mark was easily seized on by every painter, and meant as emblematical of the first. Yet the sacred text represents the two as distinct. The genius of Leonardo alone contrived to keep them so in painting. In his right hand the traitor holds a purse; but his left is extended and slightly curved, in the very position we described as denoting theft, which in reality is imitative of the pilferer's act in drawing to him, and enclosing within his hand, the thing which he steals. The painter too, by a clever device, left no doubt of the import of the action. For while all the rest of the bread on the table is of a coarse quality, he placed one white loaf just beyond Judas's hand, as the object towards which it was tending. By this simple expedient, he not only defines the action, but gives us the most contemptible and detestable idea of the avaricious wretch, who could thus take advantage of the confusion which his master's home-driven declaration of a traitor being among the company

* Jo. xii. 6. *

made, to pilfer a miserable morsel of finer bread. And in fact his attitude seems to represent him as looking round to see whether all are so engaged, that his hand, moving in an opposite direction from his eye, may perpetrate the theft.

If from this perfect incarnation of baseness we turn to the principal figure, the purest and sweetest expression imaginable of superhuman excellence, we have the attitude and action exactly required in loving expostulation; the hands thrown down with the palm upwards, and the head bent forward and inclined to one side. No other action could possibly so well express the words: "one of you is about to betray me."* It was a master thought of the artist's to select this moment for the subject of his picture of the last supper. Generally the institution of the blessed Eucharist is chosen, which allows no room for the play of human passions, and must unite the expression of all the countenances in a common sentiment of love and adoration. But the moment here chosen, immediately after our Saviour had uttered the words just quoted, admitted every variety of expression, and a greater action. On his right we have St. John in the deepest attitude of affectionate grief,—that is, with his hands crossed into one another.* But Peter's predominant feeling is fervid zeal; pressing upon the back of Judas; treading upon his brother's foot, he urges John by the most energetic gesture to ascertain exactly who the traitor is. Any Italian would at once understand this upon seeing the fore-finger pressed upon John's breast. At the same time, his right arm a-kimbo, with a knife in its hand,† too well expresses a determined purpose of defending, if necessary, by violence the life of his master. Another of the apostles, however, meant for James, seizes his shoulder to draw him back, while of the two other figures on that side, Andrew raises his hand in an attitude expressive of astonishment mingled with horror, and Philip, standing up, leans forward to ascertain the cause of a commotion, which his distance has not allowed him to hear. On the other side of our Saviour there is equal expression: one apostle is in the act of asking earnestly who is the wretch, and Jude, beside him, no less earnestly protesting his own innocence. His head leans on one side as he presses his

* De Jorio, p. 203. "*Palmulis in alternas digitorum vicissitudines connexis, ubertim flebam,*" says Apuleius, p. 43. St. Gregory attributes the same attitude to St. Scholastica, when her brother refused her request that he would stay with her: "*Inertas digitis manus super mensam posuit,*" the very attitude of John in the picture.

† See De Jorio, p. 200. It has been sometimes supposed that the knife is a later addition, when the painting was restored; but it is given in engravings anterior to the oldest retouchings.

hands to his bosom, appearing at the same time to open his vest, desirous to lay it bare before his master. The last figure on this side manifestly expresses that he considers the thing impossible, the position of the hands and head are such as, in Italy, would signify such a doubt; and the person standing up, by pointing with both his hands to our Lord, while his head is turned towards his incredulous companion, no less plainly answers him by appealing to the express declaration of their Redeemer. Another between them is more calmly assuring him of the fact.

• We have dwelt upon this sublime work of art, and selected it from a thousand others, both on account of its truly eloquent character, and because it is better known than most pictures, through the many prints and even medallions published of it. It is evident that an artist who wishes to paint an Italian scene, or who desires to rival the expressiveness of the great masters, should be fully acquainted with this language of signs, as practised in their country. Instead of the dry and almost inanimate colloquies held among us, every knot of talkers there presents a group with varied attitudes, expression, and gesture ready to be drawn. It is the “pays de cocagne” of artists, where, if the streets are not paved with gold, living pictures run about them, seeming to call out, “Come and sketch me.” A study of its peasantry is worth a thousand abstract treatises upon action and expression.

But we think such a study would be generally beneficial both in private and in public life. In the first place, it would rid us of the elegancies of our present elocution in both. It would annihilate the race of button-holders.* An Italian has no hand left for this “argumentum ad fibulam;” he wants all his fingers to himself, without one to spare for thus grappling you, as the Romans did the Carthaginians in their first naval engagement. There would be an end too of all string-twirling, by being deprived of which it has been said that celebrated pleaders have lost important causes; and which Addison somewhere describes in hustings’ eloquence, as “cheapening beaver,” by turning and displaying, to gaping spectators, all the phases of a hat, its crescent-shaped rims, and its full rotundity of top. But seriously speaking, we do think that our pulpit eloquence would be greatly improved by a study of Italian gesture; of action, not considered as the poisoning of limbs alternately or by given laws, the stretching out of the right hand at one member of a sentence, and of the left at another, as silly books on elocution describe, but of action considered as language addressed to the eyes, which as definitely

* We recollect to have heard of a celebrated Professor of Experimental Philosophy having suspended an address to a philosophical society, by turning to the attendant with the words—“John, fetch me my lecturing stick.” Armed with this baton the address was no longer a failure.

conveys ideas through them as the words do through the ears, and which consequently rivets the spectator as much as the auditor, and makes men long to see the orator. The oratorical action of Italy is substantially the same as the colloquial, only performed with greater deliberation, dignity, and grace. Hence it is not the result of study, but rather of attention. It is perfectly dramatic, and often represents the action described by the words. If, for instance, a book be appealed to, the left palm is displayed, while the forefinger of the right appears to trace the lines upon it, or the entire hand strikes upon it to express defiance joined to the appeal. The speaker will appear to listen to a heavenly concert when he describes it, or to look down with horror into the place of torments if he draws a picture of its woes. To a stranger there seems to be often exaggeration in all this, and we own that we sometimes have seen representative action carried to excess.* But the good taste of the natives is disgusted by such exhibitions, except perhaps in ruder districts; and on the whole, we should say that the action of the Italian pulpit is as removed from vulgarity or caricature on one side, as it is from tameness and insipidity on the other. The fingers, indeed, which are of little use to an English speaker, whose action is chiefly in the arm, are in constant use, especially in enumerating or dividing a subject. This is the sort of gesture which appears most offensive to Northerners, yet it is the one given by the immortal artist before-mentioned to his exquisite Christ, now in the National Gallery, and the one that can be most accurately traced to classical times, through the descriptions of their writers.

The more indeed that we compare ancient and modern Italy, the more we discover the minute analogies between the two, and the resemblance of character, habits, and feelings, between their inhabitants. We have been occasionally surprised and delighted to discover this in the ordinary manners of the people, in actions or phrases generally overlooked by travellers. We remember, for instance, being at a loss to explain the custom of visitors, who, finding your room-door ajar, are not sure if you are within, opening it with the salutation "*Deo gratias*," "thanks be to God." An officer of the Roman custom-house, who reached an English gentleman's apartment, after thus exclaiming at every door of the suite, was supposed by the gentleman to be announcing his own name, and used to amuse his friends by telling them, how through the whole interview he was politely addressed as "Signor Deo gratias." We used to think it a rather inappropriate salutation, as more in the form of an answer than of a first address. But we were soon reconciled to it, on finding in St. Augustine, that the ancient Christians always saluted with the same words,

and were ridiculed for it by the Circumcellions, who substituted the formulary of "*Deo laudes*," "praise be to God." The holy father enters into a long vindication of the Catholic salutation.* Thus has a familiar little custom been jealously preserved in social intercourse from the fourth century at least, and probably from a still remoter antiquity.

But we must really put an end to our unintended garrulity; for we have seen the phantasm, or "simulacrum," of our reader, for some time back, drawing its closed fists towards its breast, and throwing its body back, as if pulling in a runaway horse, to signify to us that we must stop, or must go on without him. Or we may have reason to apprehend, lest some one who has long since noticed these matters, should put his thumb to his chin and wag his expanded hand before it, perhaps tacking to its little finger the thumb of the other equally left pendulous, by way of telling us that all we have said is but an old story; or, what we imagine still more probable, lest a great many may let their arms hang listlessly down, and heave a sigh which only escapes in a puff through the half-closed lips, all which we should unerringly interpret to the effect, that we have inflicted on them that untranslatable species of the genus BORE, "*una solennissima seccatura*."

ART. II.—1. *History of Ireland*, by Thomas Moore, Esq. London. 1835.

2. *History of Ireland, from the Invasion under Henry II. to its Union with Great Britain*, by Francis Plowden. New Edition. London. 1831.

3. *History of Ireland, from the earliest period to the year 1814*. By Stephen Barlow, A.M.

4. *Inland Navigation, &c. of Ireland*. By C. W. Williams, Esq. 2d Edition. Dublin. 1833.

5. *Report of Commissioners of Shannon Navigation*, 1836.

6. *Report of Committee of the House of Commons on Light-houses*. 1834.

7. *Return to an Order of the House of Commons for Evidence before Revenue Commissioners relative to Irish Western Harbours*. 1834.

8. *Other Parliamentary Documents*.

THERE is no triter and no sadder truism, than that the history of Ireland is a melancholy recital. The most eager lover of his country, when he looks back upon what Ireland has

* Enarrat. in Psalm. cxxii. tom. viii. p. 680, ed. Louv.

been through the long dim reach of past ages, can find but few places upon which his eye can rest with pleasure, and when he lights on such at times, the contemplation is soon darkened and saddened by the murky cloud of misfortunes and of miseries by which they are surrounded. One solitary brightness is constant and pervading—but it is not of things belonging to this world. It is the attachment, unceasing, uncompromising, once triumphant, long-suffering, of the Irish people to their religion—the ancient faith of Christendom. In all political matters, the review is melancholy indeed. In the earlier times, a myriad of petty wars, dethronements, assassinations, invasions by northern pirates, miseries from divine visitations and from the hand of man. In later times, throughout the black record of English possession of our island, every variety of outrage and tyranny inflicted by the stranger, domestic divisions fomented and encouraged, treacheries the vilest and the most savage not only practised but gloried in, desolating and ruinous civil wars, crushing and grinding laws, and all the long arrear in our heavy account against England. Looking back and seeing, on the one hand, what the history of our country has been, from the remotest period that it notices, down to the present day; and, on the other, beholding what that country and her people are, the first impulse would almost lead us to question the decrees of Divine Providence. A country blest by nature with every thing that is requisite for prosperity—fertility in her fields, noble harbours opening along her coasts, a mild and genial climate, and rivers winding in numbers throughout her whole extent;—a people, hardy, industrious in the extreme, brave, cheerful, kind-hearted, and sincerely attached to their religion;—surely it is not speaking in an idle strain of prophecy to say, that a mighty future is in reserve for Ireland and her children, to compensate for all the dreary annals of their bygone sufferings and mishaps. Such a future *is* in reserve for her; the horizon before us is brightening rapidly with the first rays of its advance. The time is fast coming when she will no longer be a Pariah among the nations of the earth. An irresponsible branch of the legislature may for a time obstruct the passing of rightful laws, and cast insults on the Irish nation—a once powerful, but now declining, party may resist the advance of improvement to the last; but not more certainly did the waters of the tide spread on and cover the strand, despite the mandate of the Danish monarch, than will the happy times in store for our long suffering country arrive, triumphant over every obstacle by which her enemies endeavour to arrest their progress. “Arise, my beloved, the winter is over, the rains are all past,” are the beautiful words of

Scripture that we would apply to our native land, in no light or profane spirit, but in deep earnest and with confidence and truth.

Ireland has, until recently, engaged very little of the attention of the modern world; and even now, it is only some actual struggle of hers that is noticed—her position, her capabilities, in one word her *future*, are yet but the contemplation of some among her own children. This is natural enough, for the generality of mankind think of little that is not instant, and pressing on their notice. Some voyagers, of a speculative temperament, foretell, from the silent, never-ceasing labours of the coral worm in the tropical seas, the formation of future continents and islands; but the majority of seamen think on the subject only when the submarine mountain is towering up to the surface and endangering vessels on their course. Even so it is with Ireland. Past rearing her head from the darksome depths of despair, and soon to lift it high towards the heavens, the mighty growth is all unnoticed and unthought of, until some ancient prejudice makes sudden shipwreck on it, and then men wonder at their blindness. Napoleon was not singular in his obstinate misapprehensions upon this subject. Even at the present day, many, not of foreign birth, but natives of the sister-countries, know and think less of Ireland than of Jamaica, the Cape of Good Hope, or the new settlement at the Swan River. The ignorance that foreigners display is more excusable, but also even more profound. The experience of any of our readers, who may have conversed with them on the subject, will furnish abundant instances. The pride of the great Roman orator himself could not have had a sorer downfall, when, on returning from his self-lauded Sicilian government, he was asked whether he had not been journeying in Spain, than ours had, in an attempt to fathom the depths of a Frenchman's knowledge of Ireland. His ready answer was, "*L'Irlande, c'est un des comtés de l'Angleterre, près de l'Ecosse, n'est-ce pas?*"

That in ancient days we attracted attention, let one of the most celebrated of the old Roman writers bear testimony. Comparing Ireland with England, his words are—

"*Melius portus, aditusque per commercia negotiatoresque cogniti. Si quidem Hibernia, medio inter Britanniam, Hispaniamque sita et Gallico quoque mari opportuna, valentissimam imperii partem, magnis invicem usibus miscuerit.*"—*Tacitus, Vit. Agricol. cap. 24-28.*

It would seem strange that a country which a Roman could so well appreciate was not brought under the wide grasp of

Roman authority. But a reason existed in the very wideness of that grasp. The effort to establish themselves in Britain had cost the masters of the world too dear. Even in the southern parts of the country, their authority was often and seriously menaced by insurrections of the people and invasions of northern barbarians. Meantime in North Britain the Roman sway could scarcely be said to exist. The indomitable Picts waged there a constant warfare, and compelled the haughty invaders to confess their impotency by seeking shelter behind a line of fortification. The vast wave that had overspread the known world was rendered shallow and powerless by reason of its extent. An island separated from Britain by a stormy and dangerous channel, and peopled by fierce and yet unwasted tribes, seemed too formidable an achievement to the war-wearied legions of Rome, and their historians easily gilded over their reluctance to the hazardous enterprise of invasion. But had they penetrated into Ireland, they would not have been the first strangers that visited her shores. Their old enemies, the Carthaginians, had been before them. The wild stories, in Irish chronicles, of invasion and settlement of the country, by Milesius, are gradually losing ground, even in the reluctant minds of those who have nothing save the fond fancies of former glories to compensate for present lowness of condition and destitution. Other countries have had their epic bards, but Ireland as yet is without one. In the fulness of time, some gifted son of hers may arise and claim the vacant wreath, should the spirit of his age prove more tolerant to *length* in poetry, than does that of the present. To him the invasion of the Milesians, their conquest, laws, and institutions, will prove a rich mine of yet unworked material—to the plain truth-telling prose historian these are legends such as amused his childhood's ear. Yet like all traditions of the dim early annals of all nations, there was for them some foundation in fact. Strangers of Phœnician origin did visit the shores of Ireland, but they came more in the guise of merchants than in that of fierce and reckless invaders. The natural facilities of that country for commercial purposes, could not be lost upon men who were not deterred by the iron-bound coast of Cornwall; and there is much and sound reason to believe that our southern and eastern coasts were the scene of a commerce busy and extensive, considering the state, in those very remote times, of countries that are thought to have been better known.

We cannot better conclude our observations on these points, than by some extracts from the first volume of Moore's *History of Ireland*, a work that bids fair to add laurels fresh and bright as any that even he yet has won, to the well-merited honours of

“The Bard of Érin.” Speaking of Festus Avienus, a writer of the fourth century, he says:—

“Having access to the Punic records, he collected from thence those curious details which he has preserved in his Iambics, and which furnish by far the most interesting glimpse derived from antiquity of the early condition of Ireland. Though the description be somewhat obscure, yet the Celtic names of the two great islands and their relative position, leave no doubt as to Britain and Ireland being the two places designated. The commerce carried on by the people of Gades with both is expressly mentioned by the writer, who adds, ‘The husbandmen and planters of Carthage, as well as her common people, went to those isles.’ In his short, but circumstantial sketch, the features of Ireland are brought into view far more prominently than those of Britain. After a description of the hide-covered boats, or currachs, in which the inhabitants navigated their seas, the populousness of the isle of the Hiberni, and the turfy nature of its soil, are commemorated. A proof of the earlier intimacy which the Phœnician Spaniards maintained with Ireland, is to be found in the geography of Ptolemy, who wrote in the second century, and derived chiefly from Phœnician authorities, his information respecting these islands. For while in describing Britain, more especially its northern portion, this geographer has fallen into the grossest errors, in his account of Ireland, on the contrary, situated as she then was beyond the bounds of the Roman empire, and hardly known within that circle to exist, he has shown considerable accuracy, not only with respect to the shores and promontories of that island, but in most of the details of the interior of the country, its various cities and tribes, lakes, rivers, and boundaries. It is worthy of remark, too, that while of the towns and places of Britain, he has, in general, given but the new Roman names, those of Ireland still bear on his map their old Celtic titles; the city of Hybernis still tells a tale of far distant times, and the Sacred Promontory, now known by the name of Carnsore Point, transports our imagination back to the old Phœnician days. When it is considered that Ptolemy, or rather Marinus of Tyre, the writer whose steps he implicitly followed, is believed to have founded his geographical descriptions and maps on an ancient Tyrian atlas [See *Heeren’s Historical Researches*, vol. iii. Appendix C], this want of aboriginal names for the cities and places of Britain, and their predominance in the map of Ireland, prove how much more anciently and intimately the latter island must have been known to the geographers of Tyre than the former. The record that Ireland was called the ‘Sacred Island’ is of the remotest antiquity. It carries the imagination very far back into the depths of the past, yet not further than the steps of history will be found to accompany it. . . . The ‘ancients,’ through whom the fame of the ‘Sacred Island’ was handed down, could have been no other than the Phœnicians of Gades, and of the Gallician coasts of Spain, who, through so many centuries, had reigned alone in those secluded seas, and were the dispensers of religion, as well as of commerce, wherever they bent their course.”—*Moore’s History of Ireland*, vol. i. pp. 7-12.

These are but a few passages hastily taken from Mr. Moore's long and able dissertation upon the earlier annals of Ireland. We would recommend a perusal of all that he has written upon this subject, displaying as he does throughout great keenness of research and excellence of judgment, in addition to the other high qualities he has long been known to possess. We trust at a future day to bring before our readers a more exclusive and extended notice of his valuable work, when it shall have made a little further progress.

If then, it may be asked, Ireland were so much known in times of remote antiquity, and her commercial capabilities appreciated and brought into play, why is she not now, and why has she not been in later times, a great commercial country? The reason why she is not, and has not been so, can be given very readily—it is simply because she has been misgoverned. The world is fast abandoning at present many old and grievous errors in political doctrines. The old fallacy of the balance of trade is exploded—protections and restrictions are at length found and acknowledged to be quite as much and frequently *more* injurious to those in whose favour they have been established, than to those against whom they were intended to operate. The smuggler has given us rough lessons as to the *impolicy*, in every respect, of heavy taxation. Universal tolerance is beginning to be considered a better bulwark against dangers resulting from religious differences, than savage persecutions. All these mistakes, and many more, have had a long existence in England. Firmness in old convictions, and tardiness in adopting new, have ever been her characteristics, often to an excessive and most lamentable degree. Her eyes are but now opening (after seven centuries of criminal blindness) to the better policy, even *for her own interests*, of a better conduct towards the sister-island. She was long blind to this, and acted accordingly. While oppression was deemed practicable with impunity to herself, it was persevered in recklessly and relentlessly. Were there wild and restless spirits among her sons in early times?—she sent them forth to seek adventure and fortune in Ireland. Did they find themselves in danger and difficulty by reason of their misdeeds and outrages in the invaded land?—she backed them with her power, and they were encouraged and instructed to use the arms of treachery and deceit, where open violence was impossible. Did the outraged and exasperated natives complain and remonstrate?—they might as well have clamoured to the winds. When the monarch was inclined to hear their prayers, he was sure to be hindered by his ministers. The prudent Edward the First was well inclined to accept the

“8000 marks” tendered to him by the Irish people, as the purchase money of their admission to equal laws and equal rights. He readily commanded his viceroy to enter into the negotiation, and though he seemed inclined to drive a hard bargain [witness his injunctions to get “the highest fine of money you can obtain upon this account, and also a body of good and stout footmen to be held in readiness when we shall think fit to demand them”]; yet, to do him justice, he was willing to perform his part of the contract. But his council opposed all his efforts, and finally baffled him, for it was their interest that spoliation and oppression should continue unrestrained. The spirit of English legislation towards Ireland, generally, can best be described by Mr. Plowden (from whose pages we have taken the above extract), in his History of the latter country from the time of Henry II until the legislative Union. In his account of the reign of the warrior-king, Henry V, he thus writes:—

“In the relation in which the two nations stood to each other, an intercourse and exchange of inhabitants frequently took place. The seat of empire, and its superior opulence and cultivation, held out attractions to the Irish to flock to England in search of employment and promotion. Ireland, on the other hand, as a new conquered country of great fertility and extent, in proportion to its population, held out temptations to the adventurous and indigent families in England. The English parliament, in the fourth year of this reign, through jealousy and prejudice at the influx of Irishmen, passed an act imposing penalties on Irish prelates, for collating Irishmen to benefices in England, or bringing Irishmen to parliament, lest they should discover the counsels of England to rebels. This unjust act, which seems almost inoperative on the face of it, was extended so far beyond its letter and spirit, that occasion was taken from it to expel indiscriminately all the Irish, without distinction, not even excepting the students of the inns of court, who were thus excluded from the study of the very laws by which they were to be governed. Every measure was carried into execution, however extravagant, that suited the ministers on either side of the water, who appear, to the observer of Irish government, uniformly from the invasion, to have systematically had a thorough understanding with each other in the mal-administration of Irish affairs.”—*Plowden's History of Ireland*, p. 153, vol. i.

As years rolled on, and with the gradual weakening and falling to pieces of the feudal system, trades and manufactures began to raise their heads, and give promise of their subsequent luxuriant growth, did a knot of merchants or manufacturers in England find their concerns not flourishing as they wished—the home market better and cheaper supplied, or foreign markets anticipated—their first glance was to Ireland; and if that un-

happy country had any similar branch of trade or manufactures, loud was their cry to have it crushed, and the field left solely to themselves. The British legislature was ever prompt in attending to their demands. Mr. Pitt once and truly described Ireland as "a country for ages deprived of its own resources, and rendered completely subservient to the interest (*as then understood*) and opulence of England." But in this he published no new discovery. What he announced was long and shamefully notorious, and had even been boasted of, and recommended as a system to be followed up. So early as the reign of Richard the Second, there were indications of this, while commerce and manufactures were as yet almost in their infancy. The system was fostered, and from time to time put in practice during the succeeding reigns; without, however, very open or decided declarations of its expediency and propriety, until towards the middle of the seventeenth century, when it was unblushingly avowed and recommended. Sir William Temple, in the year 1673, thus wrote to the then viceroy of Ireland: "Regard must be had to those points wherein the trade of Ireland comes to interfere with the trade of England, in which case the encouragement of such trade ought to be either declined or moderated, so as to give way to the trade of England." For a compendious and detailed account of all that has been done, from the earlier times of the connexion down to a late day, with the sanction of the British legislature,* to cripple and fetter Irish industry, we would refer our readers to a publication entitled, "Hints to Hardinge;" forming one of a series of excellent political tracts, from the pen of Mr. Staunton, editor of the *Dublin Morning Register* newspaper. For these and similar writings, Mr. Staunton well deserves the gratitude of his fellow-countrymen.

Sir William Temple's advice was most fully acted upon by the boasted "Deliverer," William III. What says Mr. Plowden? The English parliament had addressed the king against the work of Mr. Molyneux, which boldly asserted the right of Ireland to legislate for herself:—

"The House (English House of Commons), in a body, presented an address to the King, enlarging in terms of great indignation on the book, (Mr. Molyneux's,) and on the dangerous tendency of the proceedings of the Irish parliament; beseeching his Majesty to exert his royal prudence to prevent their 'being drawn into a precedent, and to take all necessary care that the laws, which directed and restrained the parliament of Ireland in their actings, should not be evaded.' The address concluded by assuring him of ready concurrence in maintain-

ing the subordination of Ireland, and its dependence on the Imperial Crown. The king promised, in his answer, to do what was thus required of him."—*Plowden*, vol. ii.

Subsequently they presented an address, complaining of the improvement of Ireland in woollen manufacture, to the "great endangering of that staple commodity in England;" and they supplicated him to adopt effective measures to remedy this evil. The "Deliverer's" answer was as follows: "I shall (said his Majesty, on the 2d of July, 1698,) "do all that lies in me to discourage the woollen manufacture in Ireland." Accordingly laws were passed to prohibit "the exportation of wool and woollen manufactures from Ireland, on pain of confiscation, imprisonment, and transportation, and by which no acquittal in that kingdom of any offence against these statutes, was allowed to be pleaded in bar of any indictment upon them within the kingdom of England." (*Plowden*, *ibid*.)

The best commentary upon these acts of the "Deliverer," will be found in Barlow's History of Ireland.

"Encouragement was to be given, by way of compensation, to the Irish linen and hempen manufactures; yet none such was given for full six years after; and in the course of time, the growth and manufacture of hemp and flax were so favoured in Scotland and England, that these countries outrivalled Ireland. But the most fostering indulgence to the Irish never could have compensated for the loss of their woollen manufacture. Wool was abundant, produced with little trouble or expense, and manageable without risk. The preparation of flax is delicate and precarious, the importation of the seed exhaustingly expensive to a poor country, the crops liable to failure from unsound seed and other circumstances, and the culture found in Ireland, by experience, to be most unprofitable. The Irish woollen manufacture could never have injured the English, since, from well-known circumstances, the greater part of the advantage would have accrued to the latter. The immediate effects of the prohibitory laws were poverty and distress to the Irish. Human affairs, however, are so contrived by Providence, that the effects of injustice revert to its authors. Deprived of the means of subsistence in Ireland, thousands of Irish manufacturers emigrated to France and other countries, where they assisted the inhabitants in the increase and improvement of their woollen cloths, and established correspondents, by which means vast quantities of Irish wool were carried clandestinely to those countries.

"Thus the foreign demand for English woollens was prodigiously more lessened than it could ever have been by any exertions of Irish industry at home; the French were enabled, not only to support their own demands, but even to undersell the English markets in other nations; and thus for every thousand pounds of profit that Ireland was deprived of, by being refused a participation with England in this

trade, the latter country lost at least ten thousand."* — *Barlow*, p. 284, &c.

Well might Mr. Plowden exclaim, as he does in one of his notes, paraphrasing the Latin author's words :

" Oh, fortunatos nimium sua si bona norint
 ANGLICOLÆ."

The English had at length the conviction of their error forced on them by bitter experience. But a long time elapsed ere they would acknowledge it, or any one of the other numerous mistakes of their conduct towards Ireland. Many of these they are only beginning to perceive at the present day, and some few yet remain in all their primeval darkness. Those, already exposed and acknowledged, England is fast abandoning. We do not write in a wilfully invidious spirit, when we attribute the abandonment quite as much to self-interest as to any other cause. Nations are not much given to taking, for the rule of their conduct, the dictates of abstract benevolence and right. In earlier times, there was the offer of " eight thousand marks " to purchase justice and fair play—in all times since the invasion, there have been the much-enduring loyalty, the cruel sufferings, the earnest and repeated and pathetic remonstrances of the Irish people, pleading for nothing but simple "*Justice to Ireland*,"—all these did most lamentably fail. What she refused to them, England is at length conceding to a better perception of the consequences of denial. She at length perceives, and the conviction is gaining strength upon her, that in crippling and fettering Ireland, she has been, in fact, crippling and fettering her own right arm ; and that, by timely concessions, she can have those for friends and firm allies, who for centuries were

* " The preamble of the statute 10th and 11th William III, declares, that " foras-
 much as wool and woollen manufactures of cloth, serge, baize, &c. are the greatest
 and most profitable commodities on which the value of lands and the trade of the nation
 do chiefly depend, and whereas great quantities of the like manufactures have of late
 been made and are increasing in the kingdom of Ireland, and are exported thence to
 markets hitherto supplied from England, which will inevitably sink the value of
 lands, and tend to the ruin of the trade and woollen manufactures of this realm—for
 prevention thereof no person shall, directly or indirectly, ship off, &c. &c. any wool,
 woollen manufactures, drapery, &c. under penalty, &c. &c. forfeiture of ship, &c.
 &c. of £500 for every offence."

Such was the nature of the English statute—the Irish parliament subversively
 passed similar laws, crushing their own manufactures. " Common sense, (continues
 Mr. Barlow, vol 1, chap. x. pp. 271-302,) tells us the Irish parliament did this
 under conviction they should receive ample protection for their linen trade ; but
 what moonshine would such encouragement be, if England, departing from the letter
 and spirit of that compact, had encouraged her own linen trade to rival that of Ire-
 land. Yet this she did, and, even by the 23d of George II, laid a tax on sail cloth
 made of Irish hemp."

accounted enemies; to be dreaded and guarded against. The results of concession hitherto, justify her in persevering in the good work she has begun. She finds herself relieved from the constant fear of intestine convulsions, and she beholds new and unthought of resources for the entire empire, developing themselves in Ireland, under the fostering care of good government. That country has always had within her great elements of prosperity. Mr. Barlow states, that "from the establishment of the acts of settlement and explanation, Ireland had rapidly increased in wealth and improvement, till she was again laid waste by the revolutionary wars under William III.; and even from this calamity she was recovering with such quickness, that in 1698, the balance of trade in her favour amounted to between four and five hundred thousand pounds. But the effects were permanent, of the restricting laws, then and subsequently passed, and insurmountable by the fertility of the soil, the ingenuity of the inhabitants, her navigable rivers, and her multitude of harbours." (*Barlow*, vol. 1, p. 290.) Now, those restrictions being taken off, her industry can at length exert itself, and all her natural advantages are free to be brought into play. What may not her future be!

Of the agricultural capabilities of Ireland it is needless to speak; they are well known and long acknowledged. Her climate is long confessed to be more genial, her soil more fertile, than that of the sister country. Her very bogs are pronounced by Parliamentary commissions, furnished with the best engineering evidence, to be easily and profitably reclaimable,—far more so than the fenny lands and marshes of England. It has been calculated that five-eighths of her waste lands could be brought into permanent and most productive culture, while much of the remainder would admit of some improvement. If we then would consider her commercial and manufacturing capabilities, we have but to look at her geographical position, thrown out as she is, in advance of Europe, and opening wide her numerous ports to receive the trade of America; possessing every requisite to be a *depôt* for the commerce of the two worlds, while her lakes and rivers offer to the manufacturer a water-power that no country of her extent can parallel. The small map published with the recent reports from the Commissioners of Irish Fisheries Enquiry, gives but the principal lakes and streams,—yet what a display is there, and how melancholy to reflect on, is the state of total neglect and unimprovement in which the great powers there to be seen, are suffered still to remain. Mr. Wye Williams, in his *Observations on the Inland Navigation of Ireland*, says on this head:—

"As to the means which Ireland possesses of creating internal trading intercourse,—besides the Barrow, the Suir, the Boyne, and many other navigations, we find one prominent feature—one great leading line of available navigation—the river *Shannon*, running through the centre of the island, and offering advantages of a double coast. Yet this first and most imposing feature in Ireland's statistics remains comparatively unproductive as a means of internal communication and trade. One half of it almost unknown, and the districts through which it passes for one hundred and fifty British miles above Limerick, deriving no aid from its navigation except in a few situations."—p. 14.

..... "The river *Shannon*, unequalled in the British empire, embraces two hundred and thirty-four miles of continuous navigation; and from the circumstances of its running through the centre of the kingdom, may be compared, for the purposes of intercourse, to *double that length of coast*; to more than the entire eastern coast of England. The great feature of this extraordinary river is its diversified character. For a distance of sixty miles from the sea to the city of Limerick, it presents a magnificent estuary and tideway, without bar or other impediment whatever, and with a flood equal to the height of twenty feet at the city walls. This part of the river possesses several deep bays and inlets, and receives the waters of several rivers, some of which enjoy the tideway for a considerable distance up their channels, and all are susceptible of great improvement. By these, the benefit of water conveyance may be extended to many rising towns, and extensive, rich, and populous districts. The great estuary of the Fergus, extending ten miles to the town of Ennis, here pushes the benefit of navigation into the centre of a district unrivalled in Britain for depth and fertility of soil..... This river washes the shores of the county Clare for more than sixty British miles, without accommodation of almost any kind, save at Limerick, for shipping intercourse. The same may be said of the southern shore of this noble stream, notwithstanding the many favourable situations that shore presents.

"Above Limerick, the navigation for fifteen miles to Killaloe, is part still water and part river. From Killaloe to its source in the county Leitrim, the river assumes a great variety of character. In some places it stretches into inland seas, two of which are above twenty British miles long each. Again it forms a succession of small lakes; and lastly, in many situations, it approaches almost to still-water navigation. Throughout its course, it possesses the rare quality of having a sufficient depth of water for all purposes of internal intercourse.

"The *Shannon*, with such unquestionable latent resources, presents a lamentable picture of great neglect, great misapplication of power, great ignorance of its resources, great want of enterprise, and even worldly wisdom, on the part of its natural protectors and patrons. It washes the shores of ten counties out of thirty-two, all of them abundant in population, and susceptible of great agricultural improvement; and although many of them are periodically exposed to the greatest distress, and even famine, yet they are without the power of mutual relief and co-operation."—*Mr. Wye Williams' pamphlet*, 1833, pp. 20-30.

Mr. Williams is most fully borne out in all his opinions by

Colonel Burgoyne, and other gentlemen of high reputation,—and by the result of all enquiries, parliamentary or otherwise, into the subject. The Commissioners for the Improvement of the River Shannon reported last year strongly upon the neglected state of that river, and its capabilities:—

“The state of the Lower Shannon, from the sea to Limerick, and of the Fergus, has been very minutely described by Captain Mudge, R.N. in his reports of 1831; the navigable channels are good, with the exception of a few points, which can be improved at a *comparatively small expense*; but they are exceedingly deficient in beacons, buoys, and marks to guide vessels; neither is there any conservation of the navigation, nor any funds applicable to its improvement. These two rivers are, properly speaking, great estuaries.

.....“The most interesting and important part of the Shannon is between Killaloe, in the county Clare, and as far as Jarmonbarry, in the county Longford, a distance of eighty-five miles, the fall is but sixteen feet. Here the Shannon presents the character rather of a chain of large and deep inland lakes than that of an ordinary river. This portion comprehends the great lakes of Lough Derg and Lough Ree, and receives the tributary streams of the Scariff, Woodford, Ballyshrul, Brusna, and Suck, forming together a vast extent of waters, which, at present, with the exception of Lough Derg, is very deficient as a medium either of navigation or drainage. The two canals of Ireland also open into this portion. Were this division of the river improved, the navigation above and below it would be brought into immediate and extensive action. To effect this great object would require two locks only, three weirs, four swing bridges, and the clearing a few obstructions in the river; in doing which many thousand acres of valuable land could be secured from floods, and the agriculture, trade, navigation, and intercourse of a vast extent of country greatly improved..... If all the other divisions were completed, and this division left undone, little or no general benefit would be effected; but if this were completed, and all the others left even in their present state, a great public benefit would be gained.”—*Shannon Commissioners Report*, 1836.

Had we time and space, we could add abundantly to this testimony. In fact, the testimonies are so numerous and strong, from the best authorities, as to the internal capabilities of Ireland, that it is most difficult to make a selection of the best. We by no means pretend to have given all those of the greatest importance; but, we trust, that even the curtailed passages we have given, will impress our readers with the same deep convictions that we have ourselves.

Of the numerous harbours of Ireland, many require nothing from the hand of man to fit them for the reception of the largest ships; while such as do need improvement, might be made of the first class in utility with one-fourth, nay, we hesitate not to say one-eighth, of the attention and expense that has been

lavished upon almost every creek along the English coast. There no expense is spared in erecting piers and breakwaters, buoying dangers, providing warping anchors and posts, &c. The same care is taken in providing coast lights; and all this in many instances to provide for the reception of small coasters. The following is from the Appendix to the Report of the Light House Committee of the year 1834, and is an official document.

" Lights in the United Kingdom.

ENGLAND :

	Light Houses.	Floating Lights.	
Lights under Trinity House	43	...	13
On Lease from ditto	3	...	1
On Lease from Crown	7	...	
Held by Act or Patent	4	...	
Local or Harbour Lights	51	...	4
Total	108	+	18 = " 126 "

SCOTLAND :

Light Houses.

Under Commissioners of North- ern Lights	25		
Local or Harbour Lights	28		
Total	53	=	" 53 "

IRELAND :

Light Houses. Floating Lights.

Under Ballast Board	23	...	3
Ditto Harbour Lights	9	..	
Ditto ditto, without revenue . .	5	' ...	
Total	37	+	3 = " 40 "

Thus we see that England has more than three times the number of lights that are to be found in Ireland; and that even Scotland, though far less "*in the gangway*" of commerce, boasts a superiority of thirteen. One of the most important of the Irish lights was not erected till within a very few years back, and at the urgent remonstrance of English ship-owners. We allude to the Skellig light, on the south-western coast. It is exhibited on a rock about a league and a half from the nearest land, and three leagues from the nearest harbour. The rock is considered the most westerly point of Europe; and very generally the first landfall made by vessels from America, is in its neighbourhood. The Florida Gulf stream too, about the direction of which there has been so much controversy, has been

supposed by many to strike Ireland at this point; and, however that be, this much is certain, that the great body of the western tide divides at that rock, in two mighty streams, that go respectively "north-about" and "south-about," encompassing Ireland, (the southern branch forming the chief stream that supplies the Bristol and the Irish channels,) till they meet each other again upon the north-eastern coast. Several disastrous wrecks, attended with very considerable loss of property and life, (one or two upon the rock itself, and many in the neighbouring and perilous bay of Dingle) at length drew attention to the necessity of doing something, and ultimately the present most useful and valuable light was erected.

It would far exceed our limits to enter into a detailed description and comparison of the harbours of the two countries; yet we cannot avoid some notice of this subject. We take the harbours of Cork and Liverpool. The following is a parliamentary return of the number of ships, with their tonnage, that have entered those ports in four years:—

YEARS . . .	1833.				1834.			
	<i>British.</i>		<i>Foreign.</i>		<i>British.</i>		<i>Foreign.</i>	
	<i>Ships.</i>	<i>Tons.</i>	<i>Ships.</i>	<i>Tons.</i>	<i>Ships.</i>	<i>Tons.</i>	<i>Ships.</i>	<i>Tons.</i>
LIVERPOOL .	1719	397,933	828	227,087	1803	410,502	906	250,360
CORK	144	29,271	20	2,603	149	29,245	18	2190

YEARS . . .	1835.				1836.			
	<i>British.</i>		<i>Foreign.</i>		<i>British.</i>		<i>Foreign.</i>	
	<i>Ships.</i>	<i>Tons.</i>	<i>Ships.</i>	<i>Tons.</i>	<i>Ships.</i>	<i>Tons.</i>	<i>Ships.</i>	<i>Tons.</i>
LIVERPOOL .	1973	438,515	874	261,747	2169	517,172	809	269,837
CORK	155	27,721	31	3587	147	25,949	27	3415

Let us now examine whether there is anything in the natural condition and position of these ports that can account for this difference. The harbour of Cork, generally called the "Cove of Cork," is a splendid basin, fit for the reception of the largest vessels of the navy, and easy of access and of exit. A vessel leaving it can be, in a very few hours, in the open ocean, well clear of all land. The harbour of Liverpool, on the contrary,

is beset with a thousand dangers and difficulties, even to a steamer. In the words of that book which is in the hands of every master of a vessel, entitled *The Seaman's Guide, and Coaster's Companion*, the entrances of Liverpool are "extremely difficult and intricate, being obstructed by numerous and extensive sand banks. The *principal* of these are, the Hoyle Sand, the Burbo Sand and Flats, the Jordan Sand, the Middle Patch, the Formby Point Flats, &c. &c." A glance at the chart presents an awful spectacle; shoal after shoal, danger after danger, besetting every approach; and all the information and efforts of man sometimes baffled by the shifting of the sands. The most thorough landsman that has ever made the passage between Dublin and Liverpool must have remarked the anxiety that prevails among the crew, even of the well-appointed government steamers, as they approach the mouth of the Mersey,—the strictest look-out kept, men sounding at both gangways, and all the indications of extreme precaution. Frequently, too, the mast of some hapless vessel, appearing above water but a few fathoms from the steamer's course, betrays the proximity of the hidden and perilous shallows; while numerous lights, gleaming from the land, attest at once the carefulness of man and the necessity of attention. Yet these are not all the dangers. The outward bound vessel may have safely passed all these, but she has then before her a long and stormy channel, with perils menacing her on either hand. The prevailing westerly winds make a lee shore to her of the English coast, of which a seaman of long experience (Captain Hugh Evans, harbour-master of Holyhead) thus speaks, in his evidence before the Select Committee on Shipwrecks, that sat last year:—"In St. George's channel, not a harbour, except Milford, from the Land's End to the Clyde, fit for large ships to run for. Holyhead is the best; yet I have particulars of *thirty* on shore in Holyhead Bay, twenty totally lost, with many lives." Those vessels bound to the westward, that go round, as some do at times, the north of Ireland, have a shorter stretch of channel to encounter, but also one of exceeding danger and difficulty; and require favouring winds of some days' duration ere they are well clear of all land. If the channel could be cleared in a day or two, the perils would be of much less consequence; but, unfortunately, a vessel may be a week, or even three weeks, beating about it with adverse winds, and be at length forced back to Liverpool, or have to seek precarious shelter in the bay of Holyhead. It is a well known fact, that the outward bound and homeward bound have often been twice,

and sometimes even thrice, as long in the Channel as they were in all their open sea passage. Masters of ships have often declared that their troubles never really begin till after they have made the coast of Ireland, and approach the Channel. Were they bound to the Irish ports, immense would be the *saving* of property, of *time*,—above all and before all, of human life. The Report of the Select Committee on the Western Harbours of Ireland, establishes a triumphant case in this respect. We quote first from the evidence of General Sir Howard Douglas, formerly governor of New Brunswick, in which capacity circumstances connected with communications between England and her American dependencies, compelled him to give a great deal of attention to the subject. We subsequently quote from the evidence of the Right Hon. Maurice Fitzgerald, Knight of Kerry, a gentleman who had given it very peculiar and close attention.

“ I think the point of departure should be the westernmost point of the United Kingdom; for, notwithstanding the improvements daily effecting in steam machinery, it is of the first importance that the voyage should be the shortest possible. It appears to me that the harbour of Valentia, on the s.w. coast of Ireland, would be an important point for departure and arrival.

“ *Question.* Has the establishment of steam between America and England been much discussed in the former country?

“ *Ans.* Very much so indeed; it has excited very intense interest, and is looked to with very great solicitude.”—*Evidence of Sir H. Douglas.*

The Knight of Kerry says,—

“ It occurred to me that steam navigation might be made applicable to a communication between the West of Ireland and New York; and I accordingly instituted enquiries as to its practicability by reference to the best authorities. I saw several Americans who were acquainted with steam navigation, and who all concurred in my opinions. Amongst the rest, Mr. Rush, American minister to England in 1824. He stated that he had no doubts on the subject, and considered that the steamers between New York and New Orleans had a far worse and more dangerous passage than that of the ocean would be to Ireland. In the course of our investigations, I ascertained that the British colonies were dependent on the United States for almost the entire of their communication with the mother country, and the post office communications were conveyed to Nova Scotia by the *West Indies*. All the colonists and merchants trading to the colonies were loud in their complaints of this, and wishing that our plans might succeed. American captains assured me, that, on their voyages from Liverpool, when they reached the longitude of Valentia, they considered half the passage and all the dangers as passed. Valentia is a saving of 300 miles, as compared with

Falmouth. The difference of sea passage from Halifax to Liverpool, compared with that to Valentia, would be between 300 and 400 statute miles of the worst part of the navigation. The average losses in the Channel are computed to amount to 340,000*l.* annually.

Q. "In the ordinary voyage from Halifax to Liverpool, are you aware how near vessels approach to Valentia?"

A. "In their ordinary course, they would pass within thirty miles; but it is now the practice to make the Skellig light, nine miles to the s.w. of Valentia. The difference between the distance from Valentia, as compared with Liverpool, from a port in America, would be even greater in a sailing vessel than with a steamer. In comparing the purpose of steaming, either from Liverpool or Valentia, the difference in length of passage would require either a considerable enlargement of the Liverpool vessel [for the purpose of stowing fuel, &c.], or she must necessarily stop at some southern or western port of Ireland to take fuel in, which would occasion a delay in the navigation."—*Evidence of Mr. Maurice Fitzgerald.*

We are obliged, by our limits, to curtail much of the valuable evidence of those witnesses, in order to have room for the evidence of a professional man, Captain Beaufort, R.N., the hydrographer to the Admiralty, and one who, to use his own words, had been "at sea all his life."

"The first object of vessels bound to the Mediterranean or West Indies, in adverse winds, is to get far enough out of the Channel to be able to adopt either tack without fear of the land. The next object is, when once fairly out, to gain sufficient westing to fetch round Cape Finisterre. Now, by sailing from a port on the west coast of Ireland, both these objects are secured. In comparing the coasts of the two countries [England and Ireland], Ireland has this advantage, that a vessel once out of any of her western ports, can weather the land either on one tack or the other. . . . The winds are a feature of considerable importance in the comparison. Taking the average of the last ten years, there were in each year 186 days of westerly, and 101 of easterly winds; and the general mean wind for the whole period was s. 83° w., about one sixth of the year. Just, then, in the ratio of this prevalent wind is the advantage of preferring a western harbour, besides that arising from the conformation of the coast. I have drawn up a tabular statement of this, extracted from the Meteorological Register of the Royal Society in London.

Q. Are you in possession of any facts on which to estimate the difference generally in sailing to the southward and westward from a more westerly harbour, compared to one within the Channel?

A. I have had a sheet of "tracks" projected, on a small scale, from the log-books of several packets which had to contend with foul winds in crossing the Bay; and, supposing that other vessels had sailed from a port on the s.w. coast of Ireland at the same time, and were affected by the same weather, I have shown their comparative progress in a series of tracks in red ink.

	Time from Falmouth.	Time, if from a s.w. port of Ireland, with same winds and weather.
The "Camden," to Monte Video, sailed Nov. 24, 1824, having been detained two days by westerly gales	2 days' detention, and passage, 13 days; total - 15 days	5 days.
The "Specy," to Barbadoes, April 4, 1829	Passage, 12 days	4½ days.
"Lady Louisa," to Rio, June 26, 1826	9½ days	4½ days.
"Goldfinch," to Madeira and Rio, April 7, 1828	8 days	4 days.
"Lady Louisa," to Jacquel, May 23, 1827	10 days	3½ days.
"Hope," to Barbadoes, Dec. 9, 1828	14 days	7 days.
"Lady Louisa," to Cadiz, March 10, 1826	6½ days	3½ days.
"Duke of Marlborough," to Lisbon, Jan. 27, 1826	14 days	6 days.

* "The average result of these tracks, in thirty instances, gives about 4½ days in favour of packets from Ireland. But celerity is not the only point of contrast; the saving of four or five days in the wear and tear of the vessels, and in the health and comfort of the passengers, are considerations of much weight.

"Q. Are you aware of cases of great mischief to the public service in the course of the last war, derived from embarkations within the channel, compared to what would have been the effect from the west coast of Ireland?

"A. This question leads to a subject of the highest importance; and I am sorry my time has been too much occupied, to search for the proofs which the records of the last war would abundantly furnish, of the disadvantages of embarking military supplies from Channel ports. The detention, however, of Rear-Admiral Christian, is proverbially known. He sailed from Portsmouth, with an expedition for the West Indies, on the 16th of November, 1779, and, after having been repeatedly blown back, did not ultimately clear the Channel till the end of the following March. Every seaman must recollect innumerable instances of such detentions; and every soldier will recollect the havoc produced in the health and discipline of the troops, when long cooped up in transports. Should we be again engaged in active hostilities, the benefits from embarking at a western Irish port would be incalculable.

"Q. Do you consider that there would be, in case of war, greater security against an enemy's cruisers for packets sailing from a western harbour of Ireland, than from one in the Channel?

"A. Whatever shortens the voyage of a packet must of course diminish her exposure to hostile cruisers; and the further the packet station from the enemy's ports, the safer for the packet.

† Capt. Beaufort's examination continued.

"Q. Would there be, in unfavourable winds, great benefit in the return packets, as well as their departure, by choosing a westerly harbour?"

"A. The same reasoning applies to the homeward bound as to the outward bound.* Their distance to run would be shortened. When struggling against adverse winds, they would have open sea-room; they would avoid the indraft of the Bay of Biscay, and all the injurious effects of the N.W. current across the mouth of the Channel; and, on one tack or the other, they could fetch under the west coast of Ireland, and thus make it a "weather shore," which in no case can be done with the coast of England during easterly gales. A collection of home-bound tracks, similar to the one of outward bound tracks that I have already presented, gives an average difference of five days in favour of an Irish western harbour.

"Q. What you have stated refers principally to sailing vessels; in what degree would that opinion be altered or affected by the vessels used being steamers?"

"A. In no very great degree; for though a steamer succeeds in getting to windward against the wind, yet it has a most powerful effect in checking her velocity when against her."—*Evidence before the Commissioners of Revenue, referring to the Western Harbours of Ireland.* 1830.

A fearful commentary upon this evidence of Captain Beaufort's would be found in the long sad account of calamities in the channels, that appears in Lloyd's list. We will delay our readers but with a brief notice of two recent cases, fresh in the memory of all. The *Jane and Margaret*, outward bound, left Liverpool on the 5th of February in the present year, with a fair breeze and having 200 passengers aboard, besides her crew. On the 14th, exactly nine days afterwards, she was descried a total wreck on some rocks on the Wexford coast, and of all the crowd of human beings that tenanted her, not one has survived to tell the story of her loss. The *Glasgow*, another large outward bound vessel, left Liverpool with favouring gales, much about the same time, and after being delayed nearly a fortnight beating about the channel, was ultimately wrecked and eighteen of her crew perished. In both cases the fair wind that took them out of harbour lasted upwards of twelve hours, a space of time that, if they had sailed from an *ocean-port* of Ireland, would have brought them clear by many leagues of all land and far upon their course.

* Capt. Beaufort speaks here, as he did before, of vessels not bound to or from North America alone, but vessels to or from South America, the south of Europe, India, &c. In recommending the port of Valentia, he states, that besides the advantage of being the most westwardly point of Europe, it has one great requisite as a packet harbour, viz., having, as at Spithead, two ways of exit. Valentia harbour has these both easily practicable; is "an excellent receptacle for shipping; and is capacious, safe, and land-locked."—See *Evidence*, &c.

In the computation mentioned by Mr. Fitzgerald of loss in the channel, the loss by *delays* has not been taken into account, although it is a very important item. Vessels have lost weeks in the channel, while goods aboard were deteriorating, markets becoming forestalled, and advances and engagements failing to be met. The delays of ships that have long sailed from America are adding to the confusion in which matters are in the present mercantile crisis. Were vessels, instead of risking the dangers and detentions of channel navigation, to run at once, on getting their first landfall, into the secure and noble harbour of Valentia, time, which in fact is *property*, would be saved, as well as the actual goods themselves, and human life would not be so frequently and so fearfully sacrificed. Were even railroads to fail as lamentably as some people predict, the common roads might be made available for the transmission of cargoes, either to warehouses in Ireland for a time, or to her eastern ports to be shipped for England, while despatches, mercantile advices, and passengers, would reach Liverpool in a shorter space of time than the most favouring breezes could impel a vessel round the coast. What the opinions in Liverpool itself are on this subject, may be inferred from the fact, that a scheme was for some time in serious contemplation there of a canal navigation across Ireland, to escape the dangers of the channel.

But the prosperity of Ireland does not depend *solely* on the chances of her being made a depôt for the commerce of Europe with the new continent. Were the merchants of other countries to remain blind to their own interests, they and they alone would suffer. She can safely trust to her own future commerce. She possesses every requisite that can be imagined. Her geographical position is good—her harbours numerous and excellent—her coast population hardy, enterprising, and industrious in the extreme. On this head the evidence before the Fishery Commissioners is triumphantly conclusive. To quote the various testimonies would be to write a volume nearly as bulky as the Report itself, for they occur in every page. The Irish fishermen brave the sea in all weathers, in the miserably rigged and fitted craft which alone are within the compass of their most scanty means. Theirs is even a more desperate struggle for subsistence for themselves and families than that of their brethren, the labourers on shore. In an equal degree with the ill-required industry, courage, and perseverance that they display, is their kindliness of heart amongst themselves, and their readiness to do anything for those who show a disposition to treat them well. What they would be if they had fair play may be judged from the fact, strongly attested in the Report, that such of them as have

been forced by poverty to emigrate to America, not only earn there a comfortable subsistence for themselves, but are enabled to send money to their friends in Ireland, from the fruits of their fairly requited labours. Were it not for the sad consequences of long misgovernment in their native land, these poor emigrants would have profitable employment at home, and while ensuring their own comfort, would be adding to her wealth. Her impoverished condition renders her as yet unable to employ their labour, as it does to avail herself of all her other resources. This will not always be so. There is a bright reverse that we yet shall see to the dark picture of what she has been. Harbours empty and neglected—abundant streams and noble rivers wasting their idle waters, instead of making them a blessing as they flow—mines known to exist and yet their treasures left locked up from human uses, or worked feebly and incompetently—vast tracts of valuable land lying unimproved and desolate—a people the most industrious—the most patient—the fondest of their country, labouring under the cruellest want—occasionally hurried into turbulence by the savage goadings of oppression—or self-exiling themselves from their families and homes—such is the picture that Ireland *has* presented. What she *will* be may be presaged from a consideration of all her resources, capabilities and advantages, brought out and developed under the fostering influence of good government, that has even already begun to spread its beneficial effects throughout the land.

In considering Ireland as she will be, it were a heavy omission to refrain from all notice of her legislative prospects. The old reckless assertion that her people do not care for the restoration of their independent legislature, is long since exploded and abandoned. An unwilling confession to their anxiety for it was wrung by the force of conviction from the present Lord Hather-ton, when secretary for Ireland, in the year 1834. The confession was made too at a time when, on account of the approaching discussion in the House of Commons of the Repeal question, it was very desirable to keep up, if possible, the delusion in England that the Irish generally were well contented with the existing order of things, or at least indifferent on the subject of the coming debate. At present the demand for legislative separation is not dead, but sleepeth;—it is restrained, because the Irish people, ever fond of fairness and of justice, have resolved to give full trial to the experiment of legislation for them at a distance. We fear that experiment is failing. The natural indifference of nations to the welfare of any other but themselves, prevails in England, with regard to her sister country, as it did in England, with regard to the quondam dependencies in America. There are indeed many Englishmen ready and willing, and

heartily willing, to give "Justice to Ireland," but these excellent men are in a minority. The indifferent and the inimical are the majority. The proofs are multiplying around us every day. The House of Lords suffered to go on, year after year rejecting every measure of relief for Ireland, no matter how small and inconsiderable the concession. Then election after election in England, going with the bitter opponents of the great principle at stake in the legislative arena, the principle of "Justice to Ireland." Newcastle was loud and warm in its declarations on this subject; the townsmen seized the opportunity of Mr. O'Connell's journey to Scotland, to express, by compliments paid to him, their deep sympathy with the cause of which he is the advocate, and their determination to lend their aid in the effort to redress the grievances of Ireland. A vacancy in the representation of the town occurred within a few months after—whom did the much-professing men of Newcastle elect—a friend to Ireland and a Liberal? No—a Tory, and one whose every vote on questions relating to that country has been given in hostility to her. Since then we have had the cases of Evesham, Buckinghamshire, Rossshire, Lewes, and others, in all of which the opponents of justice and freedom have been triumphant. We will not detain the reader with reciting each of these, but turn at once to the recent "*damning proof*" of indifference or hostility to Ireland, pervading the English constituencies. In Westminster, the boasted head-quarters of liberalism, the stronghold that baffled the Tories in the height of their power and influence, and returned for years the man who advocated *English* liberties;—in Westminster a contest has been between this man, now renegade to the principles of his life, and a Liberal, young indeed, but still one who has already proved in parliament his devotion to the good cause. The former, with all an apostate's proverbial zeal, outdid even his new friends the Tories in denunciations against the claims of Ireland, and thus made them the subject of the conflict. The election came on—and by a majority of near *six-hundred*, the men of Westminster, the men who had vanquished and baffled the Tories in all their "pride and place," now returned the renegade Liberal, the enemy to Ireland, and thus announced to the world that they would not give that country "justice."

The experiment is thus, as we have said, failing. Yet the Irish people are content still to continue it—at the same time the desire for a separate legislature is silently and every day more and more gathering strength deep within their bosoms. The day of open declaration seems hurrying on, and when it comes, those who dream that a Repeal of the Union is a bygone wish will be rudely awoke indeed and astonished at the force that will

then be developed. No anxiety to avoid an unpleasant topic of consideration, no feelings of involuntary and almost innate haughtiness towards what they deem an inferior country, should prevent rational-minded Englishmen from contemplating the possibility of the revival of the cry for a dissolution of the legislative union. Let them of this be assured, that that cry will not be raised again until the Irish people deem it their only resource before the "ultima ratio," the appeal to arms, to which we trust they will never be forced to have recourse. Let them of this also be assured, that in proportion with the patience—the submissive and persevering expectation of "justice" from the United Parliament, that the men of Ireland have evinced, during the last three years, through all the taunts, insults, injuries, and rejections that have been heaped upon them—in proportion with that patience is the deep concentration of their resolves to right themselves, if others will not right them—and in the same proportion will be the energy and the power with which they will pursue their determination to its accomplishment. Now is the time for counselling and deliberating. If the total repeal of the union be absolutely inadmissible, is there no intermediate measure—can no compromise be effected? The federal system is succeeding in America—are there any circumstances in the condition of these countries to render it a failure here? A recent careful investigator into the state of America, M. de Tocqueville, in his *Démocratie en Amérique* demonstrates that to ensure the well-working of a federal system of government, the chief requisite is the enlightenment of the people. Surely the inhabitants of the United Kingdom will not confess to the charge of being behind the Americans in point of intelligence and civilization. They are well and abundantly qualified to deal with their own local affairs, and to choose whom to send, as the best representatives of their opinions on matters of general importance and interest, to a general senate in London. Would it not ensure a far closer attention to the general concerns of the empire at large, if the multitude of local matters were taken from the cognizance of the Imperial Parliament and left to the management of "Houses of Assembly," one sitting in each of the three kingdoms. The manner in which business is gone over at present is preposterous and unseemly, and at the same time unavoidable. The Imperial Parliament has by far too much to do, and is encumbered with too great a crowd of members. The number of the latter is a serious obstacle to business;—the noise—the bustle—the impatience—the crowd—all these obstruct and annoy the really "working" men, and impede legislation. Yet how is this number to be reduced? Will England consent to have her representatives lessened? Ireland certainly will con-

sent to no diminution of hers. She has at present little more than the fifth of the number belonging to the former country, while her population is two-thirds of that of England, and two of her members cannot be said to represent her, as they are sent into Parliament by her small and solitary university, which has always been inveterately hostile to her interests. Irish writers contended thirty years ago that she was entitled to *one hundred and sixty-nine* representatives, and even Lord Castlereagh declared she ought to have one hundred and eight, although he took care to give her no more than one hundred. She, therefore, will consent to no reduction unless England reduces first, and that in a much greater proportion. It is very doubtful if the latter country will consent to this. A better remedy would be found in the adoption of the federal system, which would at the same time reduce the business to be done, and afford an opportunity for a fairer adjustment and a lower amount of members. These results are each of much importance. The most casual glance at the votes and proceedings of the House of Commons demonstrates the absurdity of the present system of dealing with the business of the country. We make no selection, but copy down the first page that meets our eye.

"Monday, April 24th, 1837.

"Orders of the Day.

Forgery Bill, *second reading*.
 Offences against the Person, *do*.
 Stealing from the Person, *do*.
 Burglary Bill, *do*.
 Piracy Bill, *do*.
 Burning or Destroying Ships, *do*.
 Punishment of Death, *do*.
 Transportation for Life, *do*.
 Pillory Abolition, *do*.
 Poor Relief Ireland, *do*.
 Shire Halls Bill, *committee*.
 Imprisonment for Debt, *do*.
 Exchequer Court, Scotland, *do*.
 Exchequer Officers Compensation, *do*.
 Registration of Voters Bill, *do*.
 Gardiner's Divorce Bill, *do*.
 Court of Session, Scotland, *do*.
 Small Debts, Scotland, *do*.
 Sheriff Courts, Scotland, *do*.
 Ways and Means, *do*.
 Supply, *do*.
 Judges Opinions' Bill, *report*.
 Recorder's Courts Bill, *do*.
 Canada, Committee thereupon.
 Supply Resolutions, *report*.
 Consolidated Fund Bill, *third reading*.
 Newark Estate Bill, *do*.
 Wills Bill, *second reading*.
 Judicial Factors, Scotland, *do*.

Twenty-nine Orders of the Day.

"Notices of Motion."

Enquiry into New Poor Law.
 Papers relative to Canada.
 Religious Instruction in Scotland.
 Amendment relative to Canada.
 Amendments of various kinds relative to
 Bills in the Orders of the Day.

Number of motions, 14.

PUBLIC COMMITTEES.

Longford Election, *committee*.

First Fruits, *committee*.
 Education (Ireland), *do*.
 Metropolis Police.
 Fictitious Votes (Ireland).
 Deptford and Dover Railway Subscription List.
 Poor Law Amendment Six.

Private Committees on Roads, Railways,
 Canals, Dock, &c. Twenty-three.

Six reports of Private Bills, two second
 readings of ditto, and two third read-
 ings.

This, the first instance that we lighted upon on opening the file of "Proceedings," is by no means an exaggerated case,—it is a very common one. There is even a facility about it that is not always to be found. The first nine bills are all of the same character, and many of the motions relate to bills in the order of the day. The case is far worse frequently,—and especially so, when, after an evening on which the House has been "counted out," all the "dropped" orders and motions of that day come in to swell the list of business for the one following. A stranger might ask, "At what time *can* you adjourn, if you have all this business to do?" The answer would be, "My dear sir, all this is *not* done,—for it could not be done—nor one half of it." Some matters are slurred over, some given up in despair of getting through with them; but two or three matters out of all that list receive attention, and that perhaps from about a hundred (often much less) of the whole number of six hundred and fifty-eight members. Under a federal system, the local Houses of Assembly, meeting in their respective counties, would give undivided attention, each to the particular concerns of its own portion of the empire,—while a general congress, or "Imperial Parliament," if that designation be better liked, would meet in London, and there transact all matters of a general and imperial nature. Let not these speculations be hastily deemed idle; a time is not far distant, when the choice may be between the adoption of the system they refer to, and a recurrence to the old plan of separate and co-equal legislatures; and the very probability that such a call may be made, cries out with trumpet tongue to us to be prepared to meet the crisis, and make the important election.

We have spoken of the agricultural, the trading, and the manufacturing capabilities of Ireland; but there remains yet one point that ought to be taken into consideration when speculating upon what that country may yet be. It is the character of her people. This has been much run down and decried even by many of those who style themselves "friends to Ireland." We do not now speak of the opinions of the lower orders of Englishmen, including in that "*lower order*" men of all classes of society, from the highest to the most humble, whose minds are bigotted, inveterately and wilfully, against "Ireland and the Irish." We speak of persons of enlightenment and intelligence, and generally liberal ideas,—many of them leading men and public characters of the day. We speak of such men, biassed as we believe them to be, not wilfully, not inveterately, but almost *innately*, and without their own knowledge, against Ireland, and all things relating to her. They *do* consider the Irish

as, at least at present, an inferior race,—degraded by long misrule, oppression, and persecution, and therefore not yet able to go alone in political affairs. Posterity will hold a different opinion. History will show them a people ground-down, oppressed, and ill-treated, in the most savage manner, for centuries, holding fast to their ancient faith and their nationality through all,—ever seeking justice, prompt to forgive the cruellest injuries and to be reconciled,—ready and generous in believing in kindness,—slow to credit the foul treachery they so often experienced,—patient, long-suffering, but persevering, in spite of every discouragement, and working out with a determination invincible, and at length irresistible, the restoration of their liberties. History will tell of a peasantry, the poorest and most destitute in the world, sacrificing all the hopes and the very sustenance of their families, by braving, election after election, the worst fury of their tyrant landlords, and voting as their conscience and their country's welfare dictate, while their English brethren allow themselves to be sold like sheep at the shambles. What is the state of things at this moment? A government exists indeed in Ireland willing to do good, but having little beyond the *will* to recommend it. Its power is curtailed by the open efforts and secret intrigues of the foul faction whom it displaced. The just and beneficial measures that it would dispense with balm and healing influence over the land, are mangled or rejected by the adverse House of Lords. Its arm is fettered down, and unable to stretch forth to give relief, save by instalments, miserably small. Meantime the peasantry are harassed and goaded to the uttermost, by the exactions of the clergy of a different faith; the blood of the many tithe martyrs is yet reeking on the ground, unavenged; the Orange corporations are yet rioting in all the plenitude of unchecked and perverted authority; landlords are vying with each other in oppression and outrage; calumnies, the foulest and the basest—insults the most galling—all are heaped upon the Irish people, their country, and their religion; and yet, never since the invasion, was there a time of such quiet—such abstinence from all crime, and such obedience to the law. This is no quiet of exhausted energies, of submission to wrong, or of despair. It is that of a generous confidence in their rulers—of a common consent not to embarrass them by any acts of turbulence, however provoked, that might give a vantage-ground to the common enemy. Beneath this surface-quiet, there is a mighty concentration of power and resolve; there is a moral combination, silently but steadily, going on throughout the land; and the vain men who wilfully mistake this self-controlling magnanimity, and this deep silence of deter-

mination, for the death-like peace of hopeless submission, are madly playing on the edge of a volcano, upon the very eve of explosion. The nation that thus in the midst of misery and suffering stifles its complaints, and turns its ear from the almost justifiable promptings of anger and revenge,—the nation that shows such an example of much-enduring patience and of a resolution that can “*bide its time*,”—that nation is fitted, if ever any were, to govern itself, and ensure its own freedom and prosperity. Through the long reach of ages, Ireland’s worst calumniators have confessed her to be ever fond of “justice”—that justice she must ere long achieve for herself, and by its dictates she will ever regulate her conduct. The delay of concession is dangerous as it is futile—it *must* be made at last. Let bigots prate and flippant orators declaim—the people of Ireland have only to persevere a little longer in their steady course of unflinching reasoning, magnanimous, and determined patriotism, and they *must* accomplish, and that far sooner than their oppressors dream of—the ultimate and entire recovery of their long lost liberties and rights.

Since the above was written, the news has reached us of the death of His Majesty William the Fourth. Be his good qualities now alone remembered, his errors forgotten. He was the best of his race that have worn the crown: the only one indeed, who, when on the throne, displayed zeal for the interests and happiness of his subjects. His youthful successor has with her the wishes, the hopes, the hearts of this mighty empire, and they are but her due. Bright and fair as her prospects and herself, are the expectations now blossoming in the bosom of every true Irishman; and the justice they have been so long denied will come, “blessing both the giver and receiver;” and doubly sweet from the hands of her whom they regard with deep respectful affection and love. Doubt and fear, and every bad and desponding feeling are now cast aside. The people of the United Empire know that their young queen has inherited all the virtues of her truly-lamented father, and the careful education she has received from her excellent mother, with all they as yet know of herself, gives a strong and cheering confidence, that a brighter time has arrived than ever yet these countries knew, and that peace, liberty, and happiness, will mark and bless the reign of Victoria.

The law of the land at such a juncture as the present, requires the speedy dissolution of the existing parliament and summoning of a new one. These events are expected to take place about the middle of this month (July). Ireland is ready for the

struggle; she expects that her sons will do their duty; and willing and determined they are so to do. Scotland is buckling on her armour, and has given us the last Glasgow election as earnest of her resolve not to be wanting to the good cause. How will England act? We will boldly say, she will act as becomes her;—she will redeem the disgrace of the recent Conservative triumphs, and exhibit herself to the world awoke from the fatal supineness that might lose her the brightest gem of her crown; ready for the good fight, and determined not again to seek repose till every stain of injustice and dishonour is wiped from her escutcheon. The Tory faction will no doubt be desperate and reckless, and spare no effort to stop, or, at least, impede, the progress of improvement. But the will of the three united nations was too powerful for them before,—they were beaten in spite of every advantage; beaten when they had the monarch with them, the country divided and disheartened, and all the offices of the state filled with their ardent and unscrupulous partizans. Since then, the liberal cause has been gathering strength by the operation of the registries, and the influence of the newly enfranchised municipal corporations. Above all, it has been gaining strength from the steady and irresistible advance of that upon which it is based—the great principle of justice. “*Magna est veritas et prævalebit.*” With this for their watchword, and with united and resolute hearts, the people of the empire will go to the battle against the fell spirit of Toryism, and they will come out of the contest successful and triumphant.

ART. III.—1. *Primitive Tradition recognised in Holy Scripture*, a Sermon preached in the Cathedral Church of Winchester, at the Visitation of the Most Worshipful and Rev. W. Dealtry, D.D. Chancellor of the Diocese, Sept. 27, 1836. By the Rev. John Keble, M.A. Second edition. London. Rivingtons. 1837.

2. *The British Critic*, No. XL. (Oct. 1836.)

IT is ever our desire to treat religious subjects with becoming seriousness; and to meet all controversial antagonists in a meek, and consequently in a courteous, spirit. There may be apparent exceptions to this rule. Sometimes the rudeness or effrontery of those who assail us is far more remarkable than their arguments; and it becomes our duty to disarm them of the advantages which these qualities unfortunately confer on men

who appeal to public passion or vulgar prejudice. On other occasions they have endeavoured to take an unfair advantage, and thought to disgust or terrify us from the field, by shaking before our eyes some Gorgon shape, which they affect to hold up as the likeness of our religion, instead of brandishing the keen and polished blade of honourable warfare. As in the first case duty has compelled us to deal with our adversaries as a knight of old would have done with a churl that assailed him with base ungentle weapons, so have we in the second acted as he would have done with a necromancer that sought to prevail by philtres and poisoned charms; and in either instance have made our onslaught, without admitting our opponents to participation in the rights of controversial chivalry.

But there are others, whom, though engaged on the same side, we would not willingly treat in like manner. If the conventional law of such lists as we now enter allow us not to lift up our vizors, and declare who we are; if the cognizance which we at present bear be that of an order, of our religious community, rather than of an individual; not the less do we claim credit for personal sincerity when we say, that we take the field without a particle of any feeling that could cloud the purity of devotion to the truth. We have no desire of any triumph over *the men* whose principles we are about to examine—we shall regret if a word escape us that could reach their feelings with pain; and we shall even endeavour to harden our own against the ruffling impressions, which allusions, phrases, and charges, wherein they occasionally indulge, are apt to make upon them.

That a sermon delivered on a solemn occasion by a distinguished clergyman of the Anglican church on “primitive tradition” should excite our attention, and call forth our remarks, will not be matter of surprise. But we may be asked, upon what grounds we unite it in a common article with the miscellaneous contents of a critical journal? Though we might plead the privilege of our caste, as reviewers, to have no law but our good will for heading our articles, we waive this plea, and are willing to descend to an explanation of our motives. We have ourselves been too lately sinned against by the unwarrantable attribution of our articles to individuals, who have been made responsible for their contents,* not to be anxious to avoid a similar injustice

* Dr. Whittaker, for instance, has thought proper to make Dr. Wiseman responsible for an article on Catholic Versions of Scripture, in our second number. “I cannot pretend to follow you,” he says, addressing this gentleman, “through the account which you have thought proper to give in your second Lecture, and in the last (second) number of the Dublin Review, of the Versions of Scripture.” (A series of Letters to the Rev. N. Wiseman, D.D. Letter II. p. 170.) After analysing the

with regard to others. We do not intend to consider Mr. Keble as personally concerned in the opinions which we may quote from the 40th number of the *British Critic*, though we do not suppose that we shall make a single extract from it that he would disavow. But this being the organ of the Church party to which he conspicuously belongs, we think it will be in our power to illustrate the doctrines, and correct the statements, which his interesting discourse contains, through the fuller developments to be found in the article referred to.

The article in the Review, which we have specially in our eye, is the sixth, headed, "Dr. Wiseman's Lectures on the Catholic Church." These Lectures have been examined with more or less severity in various publications; and, should it be the author's intention to reply systematically to them all, we may appear to step in between him and his just quarrel, by prematurely singling out this criticism for our present observations. Such, however, is not our intention. We mean not to attack its contents, as Dr. Wiseman's champions, but only to discuss it as a manifesto of the principles, and a vindication of the claims, maintained by the party that consider themselves the true upholders and representatives of the English Church. And as the method by them pursued involves necessarily a manifold charge of misrepresen-

statements of this article regarding one or two versions, he draws from them conclusions intended to be ruinous to Dr. Wiseman's character as a scholar. "The specimens which I have given are quite sufficient to fix your character for ever as a man of patient and faithful research." (p. 179.) "In the account which you have given of Brucioli's bible, there is not one particle of truth, with the exception of the date of the *editio princeps*. I am convinced you never saw the book, &c. This is not a scholar-like mode of proceeding; and, for myself, I can only say, that after this specimen of your biblical researches, I would not trust to your accuracy in any one particular, without references to the original authorities." (p. 175.) "You will, however, permit me to remark, that, after having detected your very remarkable (not to say singular and somewhat extraordinary) dealing with Brucioli's version, I do not exactly see what right you have to speak disrespectfully of Mr. H. Horne." (Here follows a quotation from Dr. Wiseman's acknowledged Lectures.) "Truly, Sir, I think you may apply your own petulant censure of Mr. Horne to yourself with abundant propriety." (p. 180.) All these solemn and uncourteous charges want only one ingredient to make them really serious—they are totally destitute of their necessary foundation. Dr. Whittaker did not think it necessary to ascertain whether Dr. Wiseman was the author of the paper so unmercifully censured. As the Rev. Gentleman is more than 1000 miles from the scene of accusation, and may not think it worth while to confute Dr. Whittaker's voluminous letters in a separate form, we beg to declare that he was not the author of that paper, nor of any part thereof, and that he is noways answerable for its contents. Not that we mean by this removal of responsibility to admit the accuracy of the Rev. Vicar's conclusions, or of his charges against the author of the paper, whoever he may be; but we feel it a duty to oppose this disingenuous and "unscholarlike" conduct of attempting to ruin a clergyman's character for accuracy by falsely assuming what first required proof—his being the author of what is impugned. This specimen may be perhaps "sufficient to fix Dr. Whittaker's character for ever as a man of *candid* and faithful research."

tation against the author whom they review, we flatter ourselves that we may justly step somewhat aside, to vindicate his character, whenever that of our religion shall seem assailed through his side.

The fearless and uncompromising revival of High Church principles by a small body of youthful, learned, and as far as we have opportunity of knowing, amiable clergymen, in the face of much unpopular feeling, of great alienation from their brethren, and of little encouragement from their superiors, does credit to their sincerity and to their zeal. They have placed themselves in a prominent position, and in the post of honourable danger. They have endeavoured to throw outworks beyond the acknowledged precincts of their Church's walls, to protest against the encroaching lines of dissent; and they have manned them, we think, in forlorn hope, determined to keep the pressure of the attack at a greater distance. We, indeed, on our side, complain, and their more immediate adversaries—their rebels as they consider them—agree, that they have seized, for this purpose, a territory, not their own, but of our legitimate possession. They disclaim the charge, and affirm that they stand in a middle position—between “Romanism,” as they choose to call it, and dissent. But, when they speak thus, it is not as a school, or a party; they boldly profess to declare the real sentiments of their church, “the Anglican,” as they style it, considering it a part of the Catholic or universal Church of Christ dispersed over the world. Of this Church, “the Roman” is acknowledged to be a part, though they think it has not preserved purity of doctrine. But we must specify more in detail the principles of this school, and we trust we shall be found to do it with perfect impartiality.

First, then, “in the sense in which it is commonly understood at this day, Scripture is not, on Anglican principles, the Rule of Faith.”* It is, however, “its only standard, test, or depository.”† There is, consequently, “a guide, though not an infallible one, but subordinate to Scripture. English theology considers that Scripture is not an easy book, and, as so considering, believes that Almighty God has been pleased to provide a guide. The twentieth article declares that the Church ‘hath authority in controversies of faith.’”‡

Secondly, “the English doctrine does not encourage private judgment in matters of (necessary) faith, but maintains the Church's authority.”§ In this respect the Anglican doctrine is

* British Critic, p. 368.

† P. 385.

‡ P. 377.

§ P. 378.

"as distinct from Catholicism,* as from common Protestantism. The Catholic gives to the existing Church the ultimate infallible decision in matters of saving faith; the Ultra-Protestant to the individual; and the Anglican to antiquity, giving authority to the Church as being the witness and voice, or rather the very presence of antiquity among us."† The authority of the Church is, however, "subordinate to Scripture," inasmuch as she "may indeed pronounce doctrines as true, which are not in Scripture, so that they are not against it; but she may not declare points to be necessary to salvation, and act accordingly, unless she professes to derive them from Scripture. Her decision in such extra-scriptural matters is not secure from error; is entitled to veneration, but has not, strictly speaking, authority, and therefore may not rightly be enforced."‡ All this, nevertheless, is not to be understood of any particular Church, but gives as its results, "that the whole Church, all over the world, will never agree in teaching and enforcing what is not true."§

Furthermore, the Church of England being "an independent apostolic Church, a branch of the Catholic Church of Christ,"|| she "claims the spiritual allegiance of the people to the exclusion of all rival claims;" "the duty of communion with her is founded upon reasons derived from absolute religious obligation;" and hence we Catholics, "of these countries, are very justly charged with schism;"¶ while "Wesley was a heresiarch."**

Such we believe to be an accurate summary of the doctrines maintained by the party whose organ is the *British Critic* concerning the Rule of Faith. We have woven into our account the very expressions of that journal, because it seems so excessively jealous of any mistake about its principles, and reproaches Dr. Wiseman repeatedly for drawing his ideas on the subject from authorities which its friends reject. Before, however, analyzing, as we intend, this scheme of Church authority, we must be allowed to dwell at some length upon Mr. Keble's sermon.

* Where we write 'Catholic' or its derivatives, the *Critic* has 'Romanist' and 'Romanism.' It is evident that these terms are not used in scorn; but our ears are not accustomed to hear them employed in any other way, and we trust we shall be excused if we refuse to admit them, and decline every other appellation but our own, simply 'Catholics.' By this substitution we feel we are doing an act of justice to the "British Critic" and its party. For any of our readers who found in our extracts the term 'Romanists,' and had not read the entire article, would confound its writer with that common herd of Protestant controversialists, who think there is an argument in a nickname. We use the term 'Anglican,' because it is that adopted by the critic himself, when speaking of his own Church.

† P. 384. ‡ P. 379. § P. 380. || P. 434. ¶ P. 435. ** P. 402.

Its text is 2 Tim. i. 14, "That good thing which was committed unto thee, keep by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us." Before he closes with the real subject of his discourse, the Professor endeavours to establish a parallel between the circumstances of Timothy, when addressed in these words, and the clergy of the Anglican Church in these its calamitous times. He then divides his discourse into three parts, proposing these enquiries: *first*, what is the deposit or charge committed to Timothy; *secondly*, are the English clergy at present partakers of it; *thirdly*, have they the Holy Ghost dwelling in them for a faithful discharge of duty?

After some interesting remarks upon the word used for "deposit," in the text, and the probability of its being a conventional, ecclesiastical term, Mr. Keble concludes that the committed treasure consisted of *doctrine*. (p. 17.) This interpretation he further confirms by the testimonies of the ancient fathers. "Upon the whole," he concludes, we may assume with some confidence, that the 'good thing left in Timothy's charge, thus absolutely to be kept at all events, was the treasure of apostolical doctrines and Church rules; the rules and doctrines which made up the character of Christ's kingdom." (p. 20.)

2. Is a similar deposit yet in the hands of Christian ministers? "Some," says Mr. Keble, "will reply to this question at once. We have the Holy Scriptures, and we know for certain that they contain all that is important in Timothy's charge." He then asks, "Can this be proved? Must it not be owned, on fair consideration, that Timothy's deposit did comprise matter independent and distinct from the truths which are directly scriptural?" p. 21. In answer, we will give the preacher's own words, when he urges the reflection that the New Testament was not written at the date of this epistle.

"The holy writings themselves intimate that the persons to whom they were addressed were in possession of a body of truth and duty totally distinct from themselves, and independent of them. Timothy, for instance, a few verses after the text, is enjoined to take measures for the transmission, not of Holy Scripture, but of things which he had heard of St. Paul among many witnesses. The Thessalonians had been exhorted to hold the traditions which they had received, whether by word or apostolic letter." (p. 22.)

Here follow other texts urged by Catholics, after which he proceeds as follows:

"If the words, the commandments, the tradition which the latest of these holy writers severally commend in these and similar passages meant only or chiefly the Scriptures before written, would there not appear a more significant mention of those Scriptures; something

nearer to the tone of our own divines, when they are delivering precepts on the rule of faith? As it is, the phraseology of the Epistles exactly concurs with what we should be led to expect, that the Church would be already in possession of the substance of saving truth, in a sufficiently systematic form, by the sole teaching of the Apostles. As long as that teaching itself, or the accurate recollection of it, remained in the world, it must have constituted a standard or measure of Christian knowledge, though it had never seemed good to the Almighty to confer on us the additional boon of the books of the New Testament."—p. 23.

The sentiments of the Fathers are then appealed to, as confirmatory of this opinion. "Do they not employ Church tradition," asks Mr. Keble, "as parallel to Scripture, not as derived from it? and consequently as fixing the interpretation of disputed texts, not simply by the judgment of the Church, but by the authority of that Holy Spirit which inspires the oral teaching itself, of which such tradition is the record;"* Again: "If we will be impartial, we cannot hide it from ourselves, that this *unwritten* word, if it can be anyhow authenticated, must necessarily demand the same reverence from us," (as the written must have done from the early Christians, when they ascertained it,) "and for exactly the same reason—*because it is his word.*"†

But here the learned professor introduces a limitation necessary to prevent a last step over the rubicon of Protestantism. When the Scriptures were thus written, they were so written as to "contain every fundamental point of doctrine;" so that now, "nothing is to be insisted on as a point of faith necessary to salvation, but what is contained in, or may be proved by, canonical Scripture."‡ This second part of the discourse then closes by reducing to three classes the objects for which apostolical tradition is a rule. 1. "The systems and arrangement of fundamental articles;" 2. "Interpretation of Scripture;" and 3. "Discipline, formularies, and rites of the Church."

This outline will leave in our readers no room for astonishment, that Mr. Keble's sermon should have been openly charged with Catholicism, or "Romanism." Now, we declare that, to a very great extent, the charge is well-grounded. Strike out a few sentences, in which he tacks his theory to the Thirty-nine Articles, and the sermon might have been preached in St. Peter's at Rome. Whether these few passages neutralize the body of the discourse, we leave it to the members of his Church to decide. How far his opinions are ours, that is, Catholic, we have a right to judge; how far they are, at the same time, those of his professed religion, let others see. But, in the mean time,

* Page 24.

† The words in *italics* throughout these quotations are so in the original.

‡ Page 30.

we will offer our remarks towards the passing of a rightful judgment.

Mr. Keble acknowledges that tradition preceded Scripture, and attested its canon. (p. 28.) The authority, too, of that tradition, was divine; it was based upon the commission given to the apostles to teach, "he that heareth you heareth me." (p. 32.) The tradition itself was God's "*unwritten* word." This authority, then, was paramount, for it had no co-ordinate: it was sole. Nay, more, it was all-sufficient; for it was the only "standard and measure of Christian knowledge." After a considerable lapse of time, according to the learned professor, "in the interval between Clement and Ignatius on the one hand, and Irenæus and Tertullian on the other; that is, after about two HUNDRED YEARS after Christ, "the canon of the New Testament had first become fixed and notorious;"* and then tradition lost its prerogatives, and Scripture became the sole standard. We ask, on what authority the assertion rests, or how is its subsistence justified? Was the divine commission or authority withdrawn from the pastors, whose teaching, till now, had been the test or standard of truth? Had it been said, "he that heareth you heareth me, till a New Testament be written, after which your delivering of a doctrine will cease to be a ground for believing?" A right clearly conferred, and not limited by, or made dependent on, contingent events, requires a clear abrogation before it ceases. Traditional, authoritative teaching, *was* clearly appointed; the substitution of Scripture *never* was;† how then can this have abrogated, or even limited the other?

But, further, Mr. Keble himself allows that "the all-sufficiency of Scripture is nowhere expressly affirmed in Scripture itself."‡ Where, then, is it affirmed? If in tradition, let it be shown. Let us have passages sufficient to verify the rule, *quod semper, quod ab omnibus, quod ubique*, declaratory that the Church despoiled herself, or considered herself despoiled, of that *complete* authority and *supreme* place which she had occupied in teaching truth, according to Mr. Keble's admission, previously to the decision of the scriptural canon. If no such passages, either many or few, can be quoted, as we are sure they cannot, we have nowhere any limitation made to the first authority, nor any ground at all for the all-sufficiency of the Scripture in dogmatical teaching. Let us balance the admissions of this sermon—on the one hand, that originally, tradition, or a body of doctrines held in deposit by the Church,

was the appointed and sufficient standard of faith, with a divine sanction—and on the other, that Scripture never claims all-sufficiency, or declares the cessation of the previous commission to teach; and we leave it to a candid reader to judge, whether the acknowledged rights of the earlier method of preserving truth, can have been superseded by the introduction of the second. But if, as Mr. Keble intimates, (p. 31,) this substitution of Scripture for tradition, as the sufficient standard of dogma, is to be gathered from tradition itself; and if this doctrine of the articles is to be considered matter of faith, or rather the foundation of all Protestant faith; then we have an instance of a point of faith “not contained in, nor proved by, canonical Scripture,” but based upon tradition alone. In a word, we have the all-important assumption of Protestantism, that Catholics err by preserving to tradition its original virtue, made to rest upon this very tradition! For, we repeat it, it is acknowledged that, in Scripture, its own all-sufficiency is nowhere expressly declared.

We affirm, that the method pursued by the reverend professor in this part of his argument, will not bear a strict investigation. In fact, it is by inuendoes, assumptions, and surmises, rather than by close reasoning, that he attempts to engraft his Church’s opinions concerning Scripture, as exclusive dogmatical authority, upon his theory of “primitive tradition.” It is an ill-jointed piece of work: it is new wine in an old bottle, which can ill stand such fellowship. The following is the passage in which the task is performed; we note by *italics* the expressions to which we beg to direct attention.

“On the other hand, *it is no less evident*, that Scripture, being once ascertained, became, in its turn, a test for every thing claiming to be of apostolical tradition. But on this part of the subject *there is less occasion to dwell, it being, I suppose, allowed on all hands.* . . . The character which our article justly assigns to the Bible, of so ‘containing all things necessary to salvation, that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.’ This character the Bible could not, from the very force of the terms, acquire, until a sufficient portion of its contents had appeared, to include in one place or another, every one of such fundamentals. *Nor are we sure* of this condition having been fulfilled, until the appearance of St. John’s gospel and epistle. This consideration *may serve to account* for the comparative rareness of quotations from the New Testament, in the writings of the first century.”

Here follow some proofs of this scarcity, and of the appearance of more frequent appeals to Scripture in Tertullian and St. Irenæus; after which the author continues:

"*From all this I gather*, that in the interval . . . the canon of the New Testament had first been fixed and notorious, and that the fact had been observed which is stated in our article . . . that every fundamental point of doctrine is contained in the unquestioned books of that canon, taken along with the Hebrew Scriptures. And this observation *being once made, would of course immediately suggest* that golden rule, not of the Anglican only, but of the Catholic Church, that nothing is to be insisted on as a point of faith, &c. *At any rate, it is unquestionable*, that by the time of Irenæus, *i. e.* towards the end of the second century, the fact had been universally recognised, and the maxim thoroughly grounded and incorporated into the system of the Catholic Church."*—p. 28-31.

If the Church of England is willing that this should stand for its demonstration of its Article, on the exclusive dogmatic authority of Scripture, we heartily congratulate it on the state of its foundations. Let the argument be inculcated in church and school, let it be urged upon the laity, and recommended to the clergy; and we Catholics may fold up our arms, and patiently wait its effects. Let it be preached in every Anglican congregation, that originally, for nearly two hundred years, the very rule of faith propounded by us was the only one, the Church being the sole depositary of truth, and tradition its only standard; and that these were fully guaranteed by divine sanction: but, that *we may gather*, from the growing abundance of scriptural quotation in writers of the second century, that a certain fact (which, be it remarked, is by them nowhere recorded or alluded

* In a note on this passage (F. p. 60), the author develops this appeal to St. Irenæus. First, he quotes a passage which speaks only of two ways of studying Scripture, but applies in no way to dogmatical teaching, or the grounds of faith. He then refers to the well-known passage of St. Irenæus, given by himself in the sermon. (p. 24.) St. Irenæus asks: "What if the Apostles had left us no Scriptures?" &c.; upon which Professor Keble thus reasons: "The mere question, if we had not the Scriptures, must we not follow tradition? implies that, having the Scriptures, we have the substance of truth, necessary to salvation, &c., so far, depend not at all on tradition." Perhaps it might have been so, had St. Irenæus shewn that he meant to draw this consequence, and not exactly the contrary. For he puts the question in order to prove that "it is easy to receive truth *from the Church*,"—not from Scripture; and that, even in his time, "whoever willed might receive from her the waters of life, since therein, as in a rich depositary, the Apostles did most abundantly ledge all things appertaining to truth." (p. 24.) Surely this does not prove that St. Irenæus imagined the Scripture to have impaired the Church's rights as the depositary of truth. It can hardly be considered fair to draw inferences from a writer's words, as though he had not himself done it; it can be still less fair to draw one exactly at variance from the one he draws. Nor, after all, could Mr. Keble's argument be, under any circumstances, correct, for St. Irenæus says nothing at all about "the substance of truth necessary to salvation;" and if his words proved the substitution of Scripture for Church authority, there is nothing to restrict them to this one object, but they would imply the complete abrogation of all traditional teaching, which it is not the professor's desire to admit. He had no right to introduce any such restriction, and the context gives no sanction to it. St. Irenæus is the only Father whom he quotes.

to) had been observed, to wit, that Scripture contained all the essential doctrines of religion;—further, that *such an observation being made*,—of which there is no evidence,—*would of course suggest* the golden rule of the 20th Article;—finally, that the result would be a transfer of the dogmatical deposit from divinely sanctioned tradition to Scripture, which nowhere declares itself all-sufficient,—which transfer takes place about the time of St. Irenæus, though no ecclesiastical act or declaration, no historical record, no voice of attesting witnesses, has preserved a note of such an important revolution! Grant all this—grant our rule two centuries of undisturbed, authorized possession, and then we may safely allow such a tissue of unsupported assumptions and conjectures to deprive it of its rights—if they can!

With the third division of Professor Keble's sermon we deal not, at present; nor do we know that we shall ever revert to it. Whether it is right or not in the ministers of the Anglican Church, to consider themselves gifted with the Holy Ghost, and with a grace "altogether supernatural," (p. 43) is indeed a solemn consideration, pregnant, to them and their flocks, with awful results. If they have always believed themselves so divinely aided, we suppose they must always have taught their subjects to reverence their words, as became their high calling. But then we would ask, if the imposition of hands, which is an "outward and visible sign," confers a grace distinct from "the preventing or assisting grace common to all Christian persons," (p. 43) is it not a sacrament according to the definition of the Anglican Catechism? For Mr. Keble and his friends will not deny Christ's institution, upon the supposition of which their entire argument respecting Church authority rests. Yet it will not be said that their Church has ever taught Order to be a sacrament. Either their theory leads to contradiction of the doctrine usually, or rather universally, taught in their church respecting the binary number of the sacraments, or else the definition which it gives excludes Order from the number; in which case, as the outward sign certainly exists, either the inward grace or the divine institution must be wanting. Now, the absence of either is fatal to Mr. Keble's doctrine, as applied to his Church or her ministers.

It is time now for us to return to the declarations of the *British Critic*. What we have said, however, of Mr. Keble's sermon must not be considered entirely a digression. We have treated the subject of tradition somewhat at length, because the correctness or the inconsistency of the High Church party's opinions concerning it, must materially affect their theory of

Church authority. If they can establish what the reverend Professor desires, a middle view between the Bible alone, in each man's hands, and a deposit of dogmatical truth, distinct from it, yet enduring in the Church, as the real Anglican doctrine,—they will have some chance of success in proving the existence of a middle state between individual judgments and infallible definitions, and between the anarchy of sectarianism and the universal unity of Catholicism.

In looking over the theory of Church authority, set forth in the passages which, higher up, we wove together from the *British Critic*, and indeed on many other occasions are proclaimed by that journal and its friends, two things particularly strike us; *first*, the attempt which they make to palm their peculiar and unauthorised sentiments upon the Anglican Church; and *secondly*, the utter inconsistency and fallacy of the scheme of Church authority which they claim in its behalf. We will offer a few obvious remarks upon these two points.

I. A great portion of the article to which we principally call attention is taken up with an attempt to prove that Dr. Wiseman has been unjust towards the English Church, by confounding her principles respecting the Bible and the rule of faith, with those maintained by all other Protestants. He is charged with "misunderstanding its doctrine;" and the reviewer is "indeed surprised that so well-read a man should not have recollected more of the divinity of Anglican standard authors, than to assert that the fundamental principle of Protestantism, as *recognised in the English Church*, is 'that the Word of God alone is the true standard of faith!'"* This is but one passage out of many wherein the same reproach is uttered.

Before the present inquiry can be satisfactorily solved, it is necessary to have some criterion, by which the avowed principles of a religion can be known, in contradistinction to the opinions tolerated within its pale. Now we apprehend that the fairest and surest test is universality of consent or diversity of opinion in teaching, concerning it. If the symbolical documents of a Church, that is, its avowed definitions, or authorised expositions of faith, decide, or seem to decide a belief, and the great body of its pastors or teachers agree in one interpretation of that definition, and allow none other to be taught, that we hold to be the doctrine of that Church. If it allow two most different, or even contradictory sentiments to be publicly taught, the holders of neither have a right to call theirs more than opinions in the

Church. We can illustrate this rule either from the Catholic or from the Anglican Church.

The Catholic Church holds a dogma often proclaimed, that in defining matters of faith she is infallible. No one would be allowed by her to teach any other doctrine; whoever does, ceases practically to be a Catholic; and if he be a pastor, and prove obstinate in his error, must be removed from his office. At the same time, while all agree that this infallibility resides in the unanimous suffrage of the Church, whether united in council or dispersed over the world, the Italian doctrine extends it to the plenitude of authority residing in its head, and makes his dogmatical decrees of force antecedently to the expressed consent or implied acquiescence, of the other pastors. The Gallican denies this, and maintains that time must be given for the Church to assent or dissent: and only in the former case considers the decree binding. Practically, as experience has proved, either opinion leads to the same results; but manifestly the assertors of neither can demand that their peculiar theory be received by others as the defined or acknowledged principles of the Church, neither think we that they could reasonably charge with "misunderstanding their *Church's doctrines*," such as would not so receive it. But let us take an example from the English Church.

Her 22nd article "at one fell swoop" pounces upon purgatory, indulgences, veneration of images and relics, and invocation of saints, and utterly condemns them all, most irremissibly. The 30th article asserts the use of the cup to be of equal importance, by divine institution, with the receiving of the other element in the Lord's Supper. The 28th, that transubstantiation is opposed to God's word. Few articles probably are subscribed with greater unanimity and heartiness, by churchmen, than these; never have we heard of a single bold spirit among them flying in the face of their letter, and presuming to deliver in church a word in favour of what these condemn. Were any one of them to preach on the existence of purgatory or the right of administering the Eucharist under the form of bread alone, we have no doubt but his diocesan would soon reprove him, and should he turn out obstinate, remove him from his situation. The contrary opinions then to these points are articles of belief of the Anglican Church, on which no difference of opinion is tolerated in any of her ministers. But take on the other hand justification, election, and predestination, and you will find them, according as they belong to the evangelical or high-church "connexion," holding and teaching the most conflicting doctrines, to neighbouring flocks, without being removed, or even chid for either set of opinions which they may have chosen to embrace. It is true that the former points

are but as "mint and cummin" compared to these "weightier things of the law;" but it is no less true that the Church of England allows a latitude of doctrine respecting them which forbids us to admit the holders of either opinion as exclusively in possession of its declared sentiments. In like manner, *supposing* that Church to have defined that it "hath authority in matters of faith," and yet to allow the public teaching of two opinions within its bosom, by its legitimate ministers, one to the extent of the *British Critic's* assertions, the other to the extent of a total denial of them; we must, even in charity as in good sense, refer this matter to those on which diversity of opinion is tolerated, and refuse to accept either as the doctrine of the Church. Each can pretend only to be a doctrine taught *within* it.

There are two ways of ascertaining this variety of opinions, upon this, as upon any other point; by the examination of its living teachers, and by the appeal to more ancient testimonies. We are willing to take either test.

And first, as to the state of opinion on this subject in the present Church, we have evidence within reach. We open once more Mr. Keble's sermon, and see the following dedication:—"To the Worshipful and Rev. W. Dealtry, D.D. Chancellor of the Diocese of Winton, and to the Reverend the Clergy of the Deaneries meeting at Winchester, this sermon is respectfully inscribed, *having been preached before them, and being now published in deference to their expressed wish, of examining at their leisure the statements therein contained.*" Surely had the learned professor preached only what the Church of England avowedly teaches, and what its clergy have received as her doctrines; had there been nothing *new*, or at least *uncommon* in the "statements" of his sermon, a body of dignified clergymen would not have expressed a wish to see them in print, that they might examine them at their leisure. Had he preached a tirade against "image worship" or such anticatholic statements as form the charges of a Burgess or a Philpotts, we hardly fancy that such leisurely examination, such a subjection of the sermon to the scrutiny of the "faithful eyes," would have been deemed necessary. We could not conceive such a demand to be made by the assembled clergy of one of our dioceses, if the preacher had only delivered the acknowledged doctrines of our Church.

These suspicions have been more than strengthened by the reception of the discourse itself among many members of the Church. The Rev. Arthur T. Russell, of St. John's, Cambridge, and Vicar of Caxton, hesitates not to call it "*an heterogeneous mixture of popery and protestantism*;" as inconsistent with the existence of the latter, as were the errors against which St. Paul's

Epistles to the Romans and Galatians were written, inconsistent with the profession of christianity.”* This probably is an extreme opinion; and, therefore, between it and the approval of the Professor's theory as sound Anglicanism, there are innumerable degrees of reproof, harsher and milder, which the sermon has undergone. Mr. Russell, a little later, upon quoting Mr. Keble's argument in favour of tradition, “because it is God's (unwritten) word,” remarks, “This is the very form in which the Romanist puts his argument for the equal authority of tradition in the scripture. True, it may be replied, but Professor Keble rejects Romanist tradition. I ask not what kind of traditions he rejects; but *if any traditions are to be revered as the unwritten word of God, the principle* is conceded to the Romanists, let the application of the principle in points of detail be what it may.”† Surely it would be discreditable to the Church itself to admit that upon matters of faith, graduates of the two Universities could differ so widely in opinion; though, to speak the truth, we can hardly comprehend in any manner so vague a system of doctrine, that a Master of Arts of Oxford should uphold, as defined by a Church article, what a Bachelor of Laws of Cambridge should denounce as “inconsistent with the profession of christianity.”

Be this as it may, it is clear that *the Church* does not receive the doctrines of the High-Churchmen as part of its defined code. And in fact what we alleged in our first number upon the Hampden case, and in what we quoted in our third, from Dr. Maude, Mr. Bickersteth, and others, goes towards establishing the same point. Indeed the Hampden case, we think, proved the Oxford divines to be only a minority in the Church. But wherefore any need of proof, when, to use the *Critic's* expression, we have *confitentem reum*? In p. 384, he finds it necessary to explain his denial that the Bible alone is admitted by the Anglican Church as the rule of faith. “Now let us understand here,” so he writes, “we know full well that this is a popular mode of speaking at this day; we know well it is an opinion *in* our Church; but it is by no means universally received, much less a principle. And Dr. Wiseman, as a *well-read* divine, ought to recollect this.” This reserve and caution of expression, for which we give that journal sincere credit, this serious protestantism that the opinion contrary to its own is *not* universal, this acknowledgment that nevertheless it is “popular,” is more than sufficient to prove that its own theory is not that of the Church,

* Remarks upon the Rev. Professor Keble's Visitation Sermon, &c. • Cambridge, 1837, p. 5.

† p. 7.

but one among conflicting systems permitted to live and contend, and yet nestle together in her easy bosom.

But the writer in the *British Critic*, enforces his charge against Dr. Wiseman by an appeal to existing facts. He asks if the assertions it has combated can be "truly, nay fairly," made, not "by a well-read divine, but by an intelligent observer of the English Church for the last twenty years? Is Dr. W. a stranger to the continual and violent charges brought against far the larger portion of the Church, of its making the Prayer-Book a "safeguard" to the Bible? Has not the body of the Church opposed the Bible Society on this ground?" (p. 385.) These questions regard us as much as Dr. Wiseman, and therefore we may answer them. To the first we reply that we Catholics should feel rather ashamed of any advocate who advanced no better proof that *our Church* held the doctrine of authority, than that she had a missal and a Breviary, as well as a bible. Even conjointly with others, we should consider such an argument equivalent to a betrayal of the cause. But, if making a prayer-book a safeguard to the bible prove the maintenance of Church authority, it can only prove it in favour of that "larger portion" who make it such, and not of the Church, which equally owns the smaller portion (*if* smaller) who do not; nor can Dr. W. be charged with injustice for not drawing his conclusions from a part to the whole.

But to the second query we reply, that at first it startled and astonished us. Our memory we feared might be treacherous, so we turned over the pages of the Bible Society Reports to refresh it, and we found as follows: The society was established in 1805, and its first report gives us as Vice-Presidents, the Lords Bishops of London, Durham, Exeter, and St. David's, with four laymen. In 1808 the Archbishop of Cashel is added to their number. The following year is remarkable for the establishment of Auxiliary Societies, the first being under the patronage of the Bishop of Salisbury.* In 1810 the list of Vice-Presidents includes the following: Archbishop of Cashel, Bishops of Durham, Salisbury, St. David's, Bristol, Cloyne, and Clogher. The Bishop of Bristol placed himself at the head of a branch society, and recommended the institute by a circular letter to his clergy. Moreover, the Committee record, with great pleasure, a donation of fifty guineas, unanimously voted by the same Bishop, the Master, and the Seniors of Trinity College, Cambridge.† In 1813, we find among the Vice-Presidents, one Archbishop, ten Bishops, English and Irish, and the Dean of Westminster. In

* Report for 1809, p. 220.

† Sixth Report, pp. 296, 306.

1816, the number of Bishops had increased to twelve, with two Deans. All this showed the steady increase of patronage from the high places of the Church. But perhaps the opposition from the body of the Church began later. Passing over, at once, to the latest report within our reach, that of 1835, we find still enumerated at the head of the Vice-Presidents, the Archbishop of Tuam, the Bishops of Winchester, Salisbury, Norwich, Lichfield, Chester, Kildare, Sodor and Man, Calcutta and Madras, and the Deans of Bristol and Salisbury. And glancing over the names of subscribers, we find that of the most Rev. Dr. Howley, Archbishop of Canterbury. Moreover, upon collating the reports for half the duration of this society, we have ascertained that *fourteen* dioceses of England and Wales have been represented by their Bishops; and *two* others by their Deans, in the council of Vice-Presidents, who receive an annual vote of thanks for their *patronage*. If, then, Churchmen are to decide the maintenance or the rejection of the principle of authority, by the countenance or opposition showed by their superiors to the Bible Society, to what conclusion must they come? This generation must conclude, that in almost every part of England, they have been practically encouraged and exhorted by the representatives of their Church to support the Society, whose avowed object is "the circulation of Scripture without note or comment." And yet the claim to authority is to be deduced from exactly the contrary supposition!

After these two bold attacks in form of questions, the *Critic* makes "a thrust in tierce," which we think we can as easily parry before it reach Dr. Wiseman's side. It is as follows: "Nay, to go higher, do we not read in our service, the Athanasian creed, which, whether it allows private judgment or not, clearly propounds that *unless private judgment terminate in the reception of certain most definite statements of doctrine, it incurs the Church's direct and absolute anathema*? Considering the assaults conducted by individuals on this creed; considering the continued struggle against what is sometimes called the High-Church party, for a series of years past, *on the ground of its enforcing one certain interpretation of the Word of God*, under what impression, or in what state of mind, does Dr. Wiseman take for granted that the English Church consigns the Bible to each individual, and bids him draw his faith thence?"*

The plain meaning of which is—"display as much erudition as you please upon texts of Scripture; but recollect that you have a certain dogma to maintain, and that your erudition must

finally, by some means or other, appear to establish it. Now, I would ask any one who feels the importance of religious truth, what kind of confidence can be placed in those who, on such principles, engage in the interpretation of the Word of God?" Reader, this commentary is not ours, it is from the pen of the Rev. Dr. Turton, Regius Professor of Theology at Cambridge, and is intended as a severe rebuke upon an assertion of the same Dr. Wiseman, that the biblical researches of the Catholic must give results conformable to the definitions of the Church.* This he seems to consider as a monstrous ultra-popish idea; his commentary on which he reserved for his *bonne-bouche*, at the end of his book, as likely to startle good Protestants. Now, therefore, stripping his remarks of that personality with which the learned Doctor so abounds, we beg to place them as a target before Dr. Wiseman's breast. We cannot suppose that Oxford will reason with him on a principle as its own, which Cambridge denounces in him, as erroneous. Nay, he never went so far as to to speak about "incurring the Church's direct and absolute anathemas."

We may, perhaps, be reproached by our readers, for extending this argument to such a length; if so, they must kindly bear with us a few moments more, while we discuss the appeal made from living witnesses to the illustrious dead. The *British Critic* indeed discards the Hornes, the Tottenhams, and others; but it refers the question of Church authority to the Bulls, the Beveridges, the Lauds, the Jewels, and a few other ancient divines. They, at least, prove, by their testimony, that the Church maintains its claim to dogmatical authority. It takes the trouble of making considerable extracts from their works.

We do not deny that on many occasions they seem to speak a language eminently Catholic; but we say no less, that they stood in their generation as the Oxford knot do at present, as men of one way of thinking, amidst as many or more, who maintained a different or even contradictory opinion. Laud was considered by many in the Church as little better than "a papist," and was suspected, whether truly we do not pretend to say, of hankering after the institutions, and dallying with the proffered dignities, of the Roman Church. Certain it is, that upon the Episcopal bench of his time were found some to treat with the papal agents about a reconciliation with the Holy See.† Many other Anglican divines, the fear of the "Geneva discipline," and Presbyterian or Socinian opinions, drove to take shelter in tradition, and to

* "The Roman Catholic Doctrine of the Eucharist considered." Cambridge, 1837, p. 337.

† As Bishop Montague.

claim rights for their Church, upon the authority of antiquity. At any rate, before we can admit these writers to be urged against us, as representatives of the true Anglican doctrine, we must be satisfied that the body of that Church considers them such. Of this we have as yet no proof. Furthermore, before we can allow that their opinions were the same as those held by the *Critic*, we must have some clearer evidence than its extracts. For we find Mr. Keble's antagonist stoutly asserting, and by quotations endeavouring to establish, that the Rev. Professor's doctrine is opposed to the sentiments of these very divines. For this purpose, he cites Jewel, Archbishop Sandys, Dr. Willet, Whitaker, Davenant, Bishop of Salisbury, Prideaux, Taylor, Allestree, and others.

Let Anglicans themselves clear up these points, and decide—first, *who* are their acknowledged theological authorities, and then *what* these teach, and we may allow them to charge us with unfairness for not drawing our statements exclusively from them. The *British Critic* is, indeed, hard to please upon these matters. If Dr. Wiseman quotes Baxter, who has received the commendations of Barrow, Wilkins, and other Anglican divines, or Jones, whom Dr. Maltby has praised,* it is an insult to Beveridge to place him in such company. (p. 392.) If Dr. Beveridge himself is cited, it happens to be a work written by him when a young man, and not published by himself. (p. 390.) As to the latter circumstance, people very seldom *do* publish their own "Private Thoughts," but rather leave them to be given after their deaths; and as to the first, we might allow the plea in matters of research or thought, but scarcely in treating of an acquaintance with the principle of faith held in one's own Church. Certes, St. Thomas Aquinas was not much, if at all, older, when he composed many of his treatises; nor do we think that either Catholic or Protestant looks to the chronology of his works, when he quotes him as a testimony of what his Church teaches and taught. And surely, that cannot be very clearly the principle of faith of the Anglican Church, which Beveridge, about to take orders, did not know to be such, and only discovered by maturer studies.

We have various other remarks connected with this topic, which we must pass over at present. In concluding this subject, we will observe, that perhaps the Reviewer may have some small right to complain of Dr. Wiseman, for not having made, in his Lectures, an exception in favour of the party to which he and

* The Clarendon press, at which Jones's work was printed, is under the direction of persons appointed by the Vice-Chancellor of Oxford University.

his friends belong. But to blame him, for not separating the Church of England from other Protestants, in his arguments on the Rule of Faith, is manifestly unreasonable. Let that church, as a Church, detach itself from all other sectaries in its reasoning against us, let it avow disapprobation of their principles, let it be as unanimous in its doctrines concerning tradition and Church authority—we will not say as we are, but as it is itself on the rejection of Transubstantiation, and then we will acknowledge its right to record a separate plea from the great body of Protestants, when the Catholic arraigns them together for a breach of religious unity.

Further, we will observe, that it is hard to make such a charge of injustice at this time of day.* From Baily's* to Milner's "End of Religious Controversy," from Jewel's "Apology" to Burgess's "Charges," we meet no traces of this distinction between Anglican and Ultra-Protestant. The line of demarcation is clear and bold; "the Bible alone" on one side, "church authority" on the other, defines the challenge of the combatants; the Protestant never haggles about the terms, the Catholic never flinches from his ground. "With this sword" (Scripture) says Jewel, "did Christ put off the devil, when he was tempted of him; with these weapons ought all presumption which doth advance itself against God to be overthrown and conquered. 'For all scripture,' saith St. Paul, 'that cometh by the inspiration of God, is profitable,' &c. Thus did the Holy Fathers always fight against the heretics, with none other force than with the holy scriptures."† Harding understands these words in the usual "popular" sense of the rejection of all *authority* but Scripture, and refutes them accordingly. Nor, if we remember right, does Jewel complain of misrepresentation. If he appeals to the Fathers, it is more as a question of fact than of right; he wishes to show that they are with Protestants and not with Catholics; but he does not allow them as judges or umpires between the two.

But, after all, religion is a practical, and not merely a speculative, institution; and we think that the doctrines of a Church may best be learned from what its pastors generally teach, and its followers generally believe. And on this view, we are satis-

* "An End to Controversy." Deway, 1654.

† On the contrary, Professor Keble writes as follows:—"As often as Tertullian and Irenæus have false teachers to reprove, or unevangelical corruptions to expose, do they not refer to the traditions of the whole Church, as to something independent of the written word, and sufficient, at that time, to confute heresy, even alone? Do they not employ Church tradition as parallel to Scripture, not as derived from it?"—Sermon, p. 23.

fied, that the Church of England, as it exists at present, must be enumerated under the general head of Protestantism, and cannot be placed in a distinct class. But its article, which declares that "the Church hath authority in matters of faith." To it we oppose, *first*, the doubtfulness of its authenticity, or rather the strong probability of its spuriousness, whereof *we* are nearly convinced. *Secondly*, the latitude of interpretation which we have already seen permitted in the Church, and which allows the Ultra-Protestant principle of private judgment to be publicly taught by its authorised ministers. *Thirdly*, the difficulties of the system to which it leads, as explained by the *British Critic*—difficulties which will not allow dogmatical authority to be the principle of the Anglican Church.

II. This last objection forms, if our readers remember, the second head of our general animadversions upon the system presented by the periodical organ of the High Church party. Our first exception to it arises from its evident obscurity, in the mind of its expositor himself. Take the two following passages :

"Will he (Dr. W.) reply, that the Roman church does *not* grant that it can decree things *contrary* to scripture? True, but it claims to decree points of faith *beyond* scripture. And this is the authority which we deny it." p. 378.

* * * * *

"We consider that her (the Church's) decision in such extra-scriptural matters is not secure from error; is entitled, indeed, to veneration, but has not, strictly speaking, *authority*, and therefore may not rightly be *enforced*. This distinction is made at the end of the twentieth Article:—'As it (the Church) ought not to *decree* anything against the same, so *besides* the same ought it not to *enforce* anything to be believed for necessity of salvation.' The Church must not enforce beyond scripture; *it may decree*, i.e. *pronounce beyond it, but not against it*." p. 379.

And yet in the same breath we have been told, that this is the very authority which is denied to the Catholic Church. The writer would, perhaps, reply, that it is the *authority* which is denied to us, and is not claimed by the Anglican Church. But, to a simple, unsophisticated reader, such a distinction will hardly occur; and we confess that we read over the paragraph repeatedly, with the conviction, that its termination flatly contradicted its beginning. And even now it leaves upon our mind the conviction, that the writer has not very clear notions of what he should deny to the Catholic Church, and what he should claim for his own.

Nor is this perplexity imaginary. The Church may *decree*, but it may not *enforce*. What, if its decrees be disregarded?

What, if men, as did the Presbyterians under Elizabeth and James, overlooking the distinction, pronounce that to be contrary to Scripture which the Church decrees as only beyond it? Must it stop short? Is it powerless in *enforcing* the observance of its injunctions? If so, then is that reasoning not unjust, of which the *Critic* so loudly complains, that "each one has to judge for himself, whether the Church be contradicting the express doctrines of scripture; and that, consequently, each person is thus constituted judge over the decisions of his Church."* Has the Church the right of enforcing upon the individuals? Then is the *Critic's* distinction futile and vain.

In fact, the idea of a church, or any other governing authority, possessed of a power to *decree* more extensive than its power to *enforce*, is self-repugnant. It may *recommend* or exhort to an extent beyond its authority to put in execution; but it must not talk of enacting or *decreeing*.

This obscurity of the system may be further evinced from the heaviness of the commentary which overclouds the simplicity of the text. The article, if genuine, simply says, that "the church hath authority in controversies of faith." This is vague enough, heaven knows; and gives little scope for practical inferences, but abundant for theories. Professor Keble engrafs upon it all his doctrine of tradition, and the threefold order of truths to be derived from it, and the necessity of studying diligently the writings of the Fathers. The *British Critic* builds upon it a more massive theory of the Anglican Church's referring "the ultimate infallible decision in matters of saving faith to antiquity, giving authority to the Church, as being the witness and voice, or rather the very presence of antiquity amongst us." (p. 384.) This "limitation," or rather amplification, of the article, is to be drawn from one of the Canons of Convocation. (p. 379.) Be it so; but the Canon would have done well to tell us, when, where, and by whom, this appeal to antiquity, or rather this summons of attention, to its yet speaking voice is to be made: the *Critic* might have shown us how the Church makes it at the present day, in order to the confutation and overthrow of those rampant errors which have long torn her in pieces.

For this we think a still weightier objection to the system, that it is theory, and nothing but theory. It has no life, no vigour, no active existence. We may weary our readers by insisting so often upon this idea; but it is one never to be lost sight of, in controversy with this party. The Church which they

describe, and which they idolize, is imaginary, and exists only upon paper. Perhaps in its beginning it may have exhibited its vital powers, by stoutly combating, and, with the aid of the secular arm, repressing, the innovations of seceders from its pale; but long has it given proof that such a vigour was external and adventitious, depending upon the interest which the state felt in its exercise of influence. Since it has been left to itself, although within it and around it, through dissent and dissension, its articles have been impugned, its discipline decried, its usefulness disputed, its ministrations contemned; no voice of authority has been raised within it, no outstretching of its arm has been witnessed; never once has it assumed that attribute of dignity, that imposing mien of command, which the imagined depositary of an apostolic teaching, and an establishment of heaven-guided ministers, might be supposed entitled to assume.

Has it been so with the Catholic Church? Was Jansenism, not half so perilous or so pernicious as Arianism, allowed by wily arts, to seduce the faithful, while no one spoke? On the contrary, although but little more than a century before, the Church had lost a large portion of her dominion, through the unhappy Reformation, and she seemed ill able to afford another defection, she did not hesitate to trace out the hidden error, and cut away, with steady hand, the cancer which had stretched its subtle roots through a part of her otherwise healthy frame. It was an operation, indeed, more painful and more difficult, than the previous cutting off of a useless and diseased limb; but she shrank not from the performance of her stern duty. Though the sectaries were anxious not to break communion with the Universal Church, though they successively retreated from plea to plea, the Holy See, supported by the Bishops of the Catholic world, tore off every disguise under which they sought to lurk, and overthrew every pretence for resistance, till the evil was removed, and without loss to the Church clean destroyed. When attempts were made by Ricci and the Pistoians, to revive in Italy what had been foiled in France, Pius VI, by his noble constitution *Auctorem Fidei*, vindicated the dignity of the Apostolic See, and united the suffrages of the whole Church in their condemnation. And that condemnation was the destruction of the dangerous novelty.

Such are, indeed, practical and vigorous proofs, not merely of a system of authoritative teaching in the Church, but of its healthy action. And such was the method pursued in that antiquity, which we are told yet raises its voice in the Anglican Church. For it was not then deemed sufficient to frame a symbol or code of articles, and then leave it to its fate, and pursue the

detection and repression of error no further; but every new heresy was met by a new remedy, every poisonous invention led to the publication of a new antidote; and singly was each starting error beaten down, and in general effectually. Nay, the symbols of the Church were never mere "articles for the avoiding of diversities of opinion;" they were not acts for settling the basis of belief and government, but they were occasional exercises of authority called forth by the rise of new and unheard of opinions. Even in the case of national churches, the same in a subordinate degree, was their practice. The Donatists of Africa were energetically attacked and condemned, in the first instance, by the authoritative decisions of the Church in that country. If then Anglicanism holds the same principles, why does it not, as well as Catholicism, continue to act upon the same system? God knows that it cannot have been from want of opportunity or necessity. Authority is an active instrument; it requires exercise for its maintenance; it is as a bow, which, if for ages left unstrung, will snap whenever the attempt be made again to bend it. If the English Church have all along believed herself possessed of so rich a deposit as this apostolic power to teach, how will she answer for having folded it up in a napkin, and buried it so long in the earth? If not, whence has a new light burst upon her now, or upon some of her divines, and convinced them she has always possessed the treasure?

How comes it, too, that never in her articles is allusion made to the manner of exercising this authority, or to the places or circumstances under which the exercise should be made? We should rejoice, indeed, by way of experiment, to see such a trial made as the *Critic* somewhere proposes, of an Anglican national synod. We should like to see the Church condemn Calvinistic and Semi-Arian principles, and deprive all ministers who teach them; endeavour to introduce the practices commended in the Oxford "Tracts for the Times," order such a reformation as would restore the cathedral service to its original forms, binding the wealthy canons to residence, and cutting down pluralities; then openly denounce, with the *Critic*, Wesley as "a heresiarch," and consequently his followers as heretics, and boldly pronounce that anathema of the Church, which the Review now mutters against such as believe and profess not, in accordance with the Athanasian Creed. Let all this, we say, be done by a national Council of the Anglican Church; and let its decrees be based upon "primitive tradition, as well as scripture, and her authority claimed as a rightful inheritance ever held by her since apostolic times;" and then we shall indeed see, whether her own children will justify her wisdom, or whether the attempted blow will not

be rather considered as the "telum imbellis sine ictu,"* of one who sinks in venerable dotage at the foot of his vanquished domestic altar.

But the practical inutility of this speculative system of authority is far from ending here. Whoever claims a right to control others, whether in judgment or in action, must offer at least some advantage in return. The Protestant has an obvious right to ask the ministers of the Anglican Church, "If I surrender my opinions and reasonings into your hands; if I abandon my conventicle, and embrace your formularies of worship, what certainty have I gained that I am securer of the truth than I was before?" Now the answer, if honest and explicit, should, according to the principles of the *British Critic*, be as follows:—"The Anglican Church is a part of the true Church; it is a national independent branch thereof. She pretends not, however, even collectively, to immunity from error. For it is one of her articles, that 'as the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred,' and as 'also the Church of Rome hath erred . . . in matters of faith,'† so the Anglican, which pretends to no more infallibility than she allows to them, may err no less in matters of faith. But then this immense advantage will result from your joining the national Church, that though it, as a particular Church, may fail and teach what is erroneous in faith, yet "*the whole Church all over the world* will never agree in teaching and enforcing what is not true."‡

Now, we ask any unprejudiced mind, whether this is not like toying with men's consciences and good sense at once? In fact, we have not gone far enough in the concessions of this imaginary, but consistent, answer. For, some Anglican divines hold the Church to be of a revolutionary character—not in the political, but in the scientific, sense of the word—moveable, like the Jewish tabernacle, from one place to another; and England is allowed by them to have had her turn, and to be probably on the point of losing it. Thus writes Dr. Daubeny, though we cannot be sure that he is on the *Critic's* list of the orthodox, and whether we may not be charged, as Dr. Wiseman has been, with unfairness in presuming to quote him, as an authority in the Church, whose champion he stands forth.§ "Though this

* Æneid II. 544.

† Art. xix.

‡ British Critic, p. 380.

§ Dr. Daubeny indeed stands up boldly against the sin of schism in all who separate themselves from the law-established Church. But we find, that in his concluding discourse, he is anxious, that each one should be guided to it by their use of his individual judgment exercised upon the Bible, which he puts into his reader's hands, that like the Bereans they may search and examine. He is anxious not "to lead them blindfold; on the contrary, he is desirous that they should see for themselves,

Church, from the days of its first settlement, hath been passing from country to country, as the inhabitants of each became respectively unworthy of its longer continuance among them; yet for our comfort we are assured that the gates of hell shall not completely prevail against it. In one part of the world or another, they will be found to the end of time. How long it may be in the counsel of God to continue it in this country he only knows. But the present divided state of Christians, so much lamented by all sound members of the Church, together with that too general indifference for all religious opinions, which, under the fallacious term of *liberality of sentiment*, now prevails, holds out to us no very promising prospect.”* Therefore, not only *may* the Anglican Church fail, but it is highly probable that it *will*. But what matters it to the individual, that the Church all over the world will not concur in teaching error, so long as in this circumstance he has no pledge that the particular branch of it, which he is called upon to join, is secure from failure? Or what claim can the latter establish, by the proof of this universal security, to a particular confidence? Could men be compelled as a solemn duty to carry their disputes before any given court of judicature, upon the ground that all the courts throughout the world could not concur in an unjust decision? It is *personal* security, his *own* safety that each one is bound to seek, in matters of faith; and to *exact* submission and obedience in judgment and deed, as a duty strictly binding, where that equivalent professedly is not given, is not only tyrannical but contradictory.

The only way in which this duty of adhesion to an insecure Church, on the ground that the body, whereof it is a corruptible member, is itself incorruptible, can be justified, appears to be this: That the universal Church of Christ, being indefectible, every particular Church which *actually* forms a part of it must be considered safe; and thus the communion with the fallible becomes a participation in the universal security of the infallible. Such, we suppose to be the reasoning of the Reviewer, when he insists upon the Anglican Church being a branch of the Catholic or universal Church. But where is the proof that the Church of England is in communion with other Churches in the world, excepting its own colonies, and perhaps the Episcopalians of North America? It has no more to say to the Greek, or

and see clearly.” (Guide to the Church, 1804, vol. i. p. 222.) This proves how little Anglican divines are any more aware than Dr. Wiseman, that their Church rejects the exercise of individual private judgment upon the Bible as the guide in matters of faith:

* Ibid, p. 159.

Armenian, or Syriac Churches, than it has to the French or Italian. There is neither common belief nor common discipline to cement it into unity with them. There is no acknowledgment of communion, there is no interchange of friendly offices, there is no intercourse of epistolary communication. There is no sympathy in distress, no common joy in prosperity, no acquaintance with one another's state and feelings. Take, if it please you, Dr. Isaac Barrow's Utopian "Discourse concerning the Unity of the Church," and apply his enumeration of the duties of this unity, and see if from them it can possibly result that the Anglican Church is in possession of a single link connecting it with the rest of Christ's Church. "If any where any heresy or bad doctrine should arise, all Christians should be ready to declare against it.....especially the *pastors of the Churches* are obliged with one consent to oppose it.....Thus did the bishops of several Churches meet to suppress the heresy of Pope (*Paul?*) Samosatenus. This was the ground of most synods."* When has the Anglican Church joined any such confederacy with any other Churches, for the suppression of error or infidelity?

"If any dissension or faction doth arise in any Church, *other Churches*, upon notice thereof, should yield their aid to quench and suppress it." Is there any Church that would, under such circumstances, ask for aid from the Anglican, or accept its proffered assistance?

"All Christians should be ready, when opportunity doth invite, to admit one another to conjunction in offices of piety and charity; in prayer, in *communion of the Eucharist*, &c. St. Polycarp being at Rome, did communicate with Pope Anicetus."† Where is the *Episcopal* Church which would admit an English Protestant bishop to officiate at the altar, or to participate in its Eucharist, knowing him to reject as fond and superstitious so much of its belief and practice?

"If dissension arise between divers Churches, another may interpose to reconcile them; as did the Church of Carthage, between that of Rome and Alexandria. If any bishop were exceedingly negligent in the discharge of his office, to the common danger of truth and piety, his neighbour bishops might admonish him thereto; and if he should not reform, might deprive him of communion." Does the Anglican Church admit in "any neighbour bishops" this right of interference, or does she pretend to it herself, or has she ever thought of using it? Would she expose herself to the certain rebuff she would receive, upon endeavouring to interpose as a mediatrix, between any two foreign churches?

* Barrow's Works, Tillotson's ed. vol. i. p. 766.

† P. 767.

"In cases of doubt or difficulty one Church should have recourse to others for advice, and any Church should yield it." Is there any example, or any chance, of such confidence existing between the Anglican or any other Church?

Such are pretty nearly his proofs of unity between different establishments supposed to form collectively "the Catholic Church;"* and, therefore, did we call Dr. Barrow's treatise Utopian, because believing, as we suppose, his Church to be one of such establishments, he gravely proposes tests of her pretensions which can only exist in imagination, and must show her to have no pretensions to a real place in this universal community. The Dissenter, then,—for we must be allowed to smile when the *Critic* or Dr. Barrow has the simplicity to call *us* schismatics,—the dissenter is solemnly urged, under grievous peril of his soul, to join the Anglican Church, not because she is safe from error, but because the entire Church is, of which she forms a part. And if he call for proofs that she *is* a part of the Universal Church, characteristics are proposed to him, as criterions of her claim, not one of which exists in her; or rather the absence of which proves that she is *not* in communion with this Universal Church wherever it is to be found. The unsuccessful tampering of old with the Greek Church, through Cyril Lucaris, will prove, to the scholar, that our commentary upon Dr. Barrow's text has good foundation.

But if a Dissenter, thus staggered, not to say shocked, at the boldness of the system which asked so much, and gave him in return so little, were desirous to look about him elsewhere for something of what is here described, he would not be long in discovering a Church, composed of many national Churches, possessed individually of rights and liberties, and forming complete governing communities; but so cemented together in steadfast unity of faith and discipline, as to verify what Dr. Barrow has written of religious unity. In our Church, he would find in practice and in truth, what, spoken of the Anglican Church by one of her own divines, must sound as a cruel jest. The Churches of France and Ireland, of Italy and South America, of Germany and Syria, of Spain and Poland, of Belgium and Cochin China, are in full enjoyment of almost every characteristic† of religious

* Be it remembered, that the *Critic* approves of Dr. Barrow's conclusion drawn from this very treatise, that Catholics are to be considered as schismatics.—p. 434.

† We, of course, except such acts of high jurisdiction as no Church now-a-days could pretend to in respect of another, such as the deposition of bishops in another country, &c. Such extraordinary power is only vested in the Sovereign Pontiff. But would the Anglican, under any circumstance, allow the American bishops to interfere in England to such an extent?

unity which we have transcribed; the subjects of any one could communicate, the clergy could celebrate at the altar of any other among them. The pastors could meet as brethren, and sit at one council-board; they *do* consult one another in cases of difficulty; they assist and receive one another in distress, and sympathise with their respective sufferings.* But the sects or Churches that are not within this pale—and the Anglican is one—have and can have no participation in these advantages of communion with them, nor do they affect any among themselves. The Patriarch of Constantinople, or the Synod of Moscow, would be greatly astonished if the Convocation consulted them about the thirty-nine articles, or if his Grace of Canterbury travelling in their parts, should ask to read the communion service in one of their Churches.

But we are not sure that we should make the insecurity of such as obey the Church of England's summons to join her end here. For even this imaginary connexion, which she cannot prove, with the Universal Church, ought, according to her principles, to be no guaranty. In her twenty-first article, she says, that "general councils," that is, assemblies of the bishops of the *whole* Church, "forasmuch as they be an assembly of men whereof all be not governed by the Spirit and Word of God, *may err*; and sometimes *have* erred, even in things appertaining unto God." The Critic, indeed, says, that this article speaks only "historically of professed and pretended general councils." But, with due deference, we beg to dissent from this interpretation. For though the clause, "and *have* erred," may be only historically added, yet the definition that "they *may* err" is an enunciation of a belief or general principle, inasmuch as it is based upon the circumstance, that all the individuals composing a general council are not guided by the word and spirit of God. Now, as this will apply to every possible general council, as well as to any actual one since that of Jerusalem, we must conclude that the Church of England does not attribute security from error, even to the entire Church of Christ in council assembled. How

* A beautiful example of this truly Catholic feeling has lately taken place. Some of the New States of South America had, during their contest with another country, banished all Spaniards from their territories, not excepting clergymen. Since they have been freed from all alarm, they have zealously set about restoring their religious establishments, and particularly the regular orders. For this purpose, agents, with large sums at their disposal, have been sent to Italy, to procure members of these orders to cross the Atlantic. They have been instructed to give preference to Spaniards who have been ejected from their religious houses by the present Spanish Government. And whenever any of them have sought an asylum in the new States, they have been received with marked kindness and hospitality. Thus has the Catholic spirit triumphed over obstinate national prejudices.

much less then] can union with her be an imperative duty, on the ground that thereby the individual is secure through union with the Universal Church?

There is another inconsistency in this new scheme of Church authority. The Church in general is allowed to be indefectible, upon the strength of that text, in which our Saviour promises to be with his apostles to the end of the world (p. 395), and other similar passages. When he says, "He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me;" the consequence is, that the Church to which these words are addressed is at all times to be listened to, as the living voice of Christ; and thus it is indefectible. But, upon these very texts, the High Church party claim authority for the particular pastors of their Church, as legitimate successors of the Apostles. But how shall these texts, addressed to one only body, be it what it may, confer two perfectly dissimilar things, on two distinct classes of persons; to wit, indefectibility to the collective, universal Church, and authority to each component part thereof? If the Anglican hierarchy lay claim to one of the gifts, they have as much right to the other. But this is not our present question. We ask on what ground are these texts thus made to cut two ways, to answer two different purposes, without any warranty for the distinction in the texts themselves? Whatever Church is declared to be indefectible, is invested with authority, and none other; and as the Anglican Church does not pretend to the one quality, it can have no claim to the other. If the indefectibility which is the consequence of Christ's teaching through the pastors, be not distributable among particular Churches, how is it proved that authority in faith, which is that very teaching, is so distributable? But if the two reside united in the same body, as in consistency they ought, then we say the result is INFALLIBILITY. For indefectibility secures the existence of *objective* truth in the Church at all times; and authority to teach, in conjunction," secures *subjective* truth. In other words, the latter obliges each individual to believe whatever it teaches, while the former assures him that it can never fall into error.

In fact, infallibility is the active manifestation of indefectibility through authority. Where the fund of wisdom and truth is imperishable and incorruptible, its outward communication must be so too. If the Church is to be heard because Christ teaches in it, the Church is *infallible*,—even as Christ is. All this is in exact harmony with Catholic truth. In this there is no disjunction of what God hath ordained; no drawing of authority for individual churches, and of indefectibility for the Universal Church from one indivisible text. Both, indeed, are proved;

but both in favour of one—of the Catholic Universal Church: and with these the natural result of the two conjoined—*dogmatical infallibility*. In their pastors, the flock recognise the connecting link between them and this great community; they are ruled and taught by them in strict harmonious unity with the entire Church.

But the Anglican Church can show, as we have already observed, no connexion with any other Church to prove that it forms a part of any larger religious communion. Either she alone is the Universal Catholic Church,* or she is out of its pale. If the first, she should claim indefectibility; if the second, she must renounce authority.

By way of conclusion, let us transfer the inquiry to another country. We were at first inclined to choose Ireland or Italy; but particular exceptions might be taken against both these points of comparison, therefore, we will place the controversy in France. The French Church has a hierarchy, less interrupted in apostolic succession than the Anglican can possibly pretend to be. The Bishops of Gaul may be traced to the second century, or even to the immediate disciples of the apostles; whereas the Anglicans do not pretend to trace their succession further back than the Roman mission under St. Gregory the Great. The succession too in France has no awkward passage to explain in its history, such as the turning out of all the bishops by civil persecution, and tacking to the succession a new set, who pretended to inherit the sees, while they rejected the religion of those before them. But putting aside all these odious comparisons, we will only assume, that the Church of France has as good a right at least to claim apostolic succession with all its rights of authority and obedience as the Church of England. We ask, therefore, are not the French Protestants chargeable with schism, since they “separate themselves from the Church, and make congregations contrary to their canonical bishops?” (p. 435.) Are they not “bound,” as much as, according to the critic, the English Catholics are,* “to unite themselves to the French Church?” (p. 434.)

It will not be said that the French Church does not maintain its independence as a national Church, or that by its submission to the Supremacy of the Holy See, she has forfeited her rights over all separatists within her dominions. For Barrow expressly says: “Yet those Churches, which by voluntary consent or

* The *Critic*, p. 434, applies to the Irish and English Catholics what Barrow says only of the English. The question of the Irish Catholics is more intimately connected with that of the Anglican Episcopacy, and therefore must not be lightly touched on here.

command of princes, do adhere in confederation to the Roman Church, we are not, merely upon that score, to condemn or reject from the communion of charity or peace, for in that they do but use their liberty.* Now the French Church is not bound certainly by any compulsion to the Roman See; and, therefore, the French Protestants cannot refuse it obedience on this score. But then, perhaps, the French Church "maintains impious errors," or "prescribes naughty practices,"—which the learned doctor adds as a sufficient reason for treating a Church as "heretical or schismatical." And who is to pronounce this judgment for the French Protestant? He himself individually? Then we have private judgment set up against and above the decision of the national Church; and thus is the Dissenter's plea made good against the Anglican Church. The body of Christians to which he is attached? Then must similar bodies in England have the same right; and Catholics cannot be schismatics who use this right, and proclaim the Anglican Church to teach "impious errors," and therefore to be itself "heretical and schismatical." Some foreign Church, as the Anglican? Then may the English Catholic be equally guided by the decisions of her more numerous foreign churches. And, moreover, according to the theory of independent national churches, each has a right to command full obedience from its own immediate subjects free from foreign controul. But, says the *Critic*, "The Romish Church *generally* is regarded as schismatical in exacting as terms of communion and articles of faith, doctrines which are of uncertain authority (p. 435). By whom is it so generally regarded? *By the Anglican Church!* And is this then an infallible Church, which has a right to set up its decision against the combined decisions of so many other certainly *no less* apostolic churches which concur in not considering those articles as of uncertain authority, and in condemning the Anglican as heretical? Or are Protestants in Catholic countries bound to recognise in her an authority to rule their belief against the decisions of the hierarchy in them, while the Catholics or Dissenters in England have no similar resource in any other country? If so, the Anglican Church comes within the gripe of Barrow's conclusion,—that if churches be "turbulent and violent, trying by all means to *subdue and enslave other churches* to their will or their dictates; in such cases we may reject such churches as heretical and schismatical, or wickedly uncharitable and unjust in their proceedings."

One of two things. Either it must be left to the individual

*. Ubi supra. p. 783.

to decide whether a church proposes or not "doctrines of uncertain authority," and then his private reason is constituted superior to the Church, and a judge over her decision; or else the decision of any foreign Episcopal Church has as much right to controul the individual judgment of each person, and then Protestants in Catholic countries are acknowledged to be heretics. In the first supposition, Dissenters are not heretics nor schismatics with regard to the Established Church; in the second, the French Protestants are bound to subscribe to their belief in Purgatory and Transubstantiation, which the Anglican Articles condemn. In either, the writer in the *Critic* has, we imagine, a hard alternative. To use his own words, "we differ from him in logic, as much as in divinity." (p. 397.)

Let us place the question under another aspect. These High Church divines say, that their Church draws its explanations of Scripture from antiquity, of which it is the witness and depository. It builds therefore upon this testimony its belief in the Eucharist, and its interpretation of the words employed by our Lord in its institution. But the Catholic Church, that is, the union of many other Churches appeals to precisely the same authority and test for its interpretation and belief. This is not a question of first principle, as whether any thing is to be enforced or not which is not clearly proved from Scripture: it is a matter of application of a rule equally admitted. The Zwinglian maintains the Eucharist to be a naked symbol, a merely commemorative rite. The Catholic and the Anglican contradict him; the former says that tradition has ever taught in his Church, a real and corporeal presence of Christ in that sacrament; the Anglican that his Church has learned from the same source to believe in a *real* but not a *corporeal* presence. Who is to decide between the two? Is it the duty of the individual to unravel the mystery for himself, and trace out the testimony of tradition through the first ages? Then private judgment again comes in, and again is exalted as the umpire between conflicting Churches! Shall the Anglican Church have the preference? But she renounces all claim to infallibility. And what other plea can she urge which shall not assume her being the only true Church, and her principle of faith being the only correct one,—which is the very matter of inquiry?

The fact is, that there is no middle point between private judgment and the infallible authority of a living Church, which being universal, can command particular Churches as well as individuals. We would willingly exclude the name of Mr. Blanco White from our pages, but he seems to us at this moment to be a "sign," though not a "wonder,"—a monumental

record of this principle, practically illustrated in his double apostasy. He seems to us to have satisfactorily demonstrated, that on the march from Catholicity to Socinianism, and the unlimited use of private judgment, the Church of England presents no resting place. It may indeed be passed through on the road, and its curious imitations of the place just left may detain the wanderer's and outcast's attention for a brief space, as it did Mr. White's; but on he must go, if he be borne forward by a consistent principle, till he reach the other extreme.*

Many observations which have come before our minds we have been compelled to omit, for really there is no end to the incoherences and impracticabilities of the High-Church scheme. It presents one inextricable confusion of rights belonging to the Universal Church with those of particular parts or national establishments. The Church is ever spoken of as indefectible—as the depositary of truth—the voice of antiquity,—and all this is said of the Universal Church. But when we come to the deference due to it in consequence of these prerogatives, by a process of logical jugglery, the Anglican contrives to step in to receive it as its right. If these divines would keep the two distinct in their argument, they would find it miserably lame.

We were not a little surprised to see the vulgar misstatement repeated in the *Critic's* pages, that Catholics believe their Church empowered to *create* articles of faith (p. 383). They claim for her no more authority than she exercised in the early ages, that of defining what had been believed within her from the beginning, and thus *declaring* articles of faith. The symbols of the ancient councils, as we have before observed, were only framed against heresies as they arose; and certain points were thus defined and proposed, for the first time, in clear formal terms, to the acceptance of the faithful. Other matters, such as the Eucharist, grace, justification, were omitted, because on them there was no error. Had any existed, the doctrine regarding them would have been as clearly laid down. And there can be no doubt but that a new obligation would thus have fallen upon all Christians, to believe definitively with the Church, on points whereon, before the definition, they could not be so well instructed, nor so accurately know the faith of the Church dispersed. Hence it is not an uncommon remark of judicious and primitive writers, that the Fathers spoke more loosely upon certain subjects before they had been clearly defined by the Church. If this declaration of matters, ever believed, but not before defined, be called a *creation* of new articles, we have no

objection to the *Critic's* phrase. But if by this term is signified that, according to Catholics, their Church may propose that to be believed which before was not believed, it is a gross perversion of truth to apply it to us.

In fact, we believe the Church, in regard to her authority, to have no past and no future. She is always one; and whatever she had ever a right to do after the Apostle's time, she has a right to do at present. When the *Critic*, or Mr. Keble, sends us back to antiquity as the rule of faith, joined to Scripture, and thereby means the doctrine of the three or four first centuries, we beg to remind him, that these times were once *the present* of the Church. The faithful of those days did not, could not, look to "antiquity," which then was not, but to the *living* Church. What was their rule of faith is ours; three hundred years, or eighteen hundred, from the time of Christ, cannot make a difference in a principle; it was nowhere appointed, or decreed, or foretold, that for so many centuries the *existing* Church should teach, and that, after that time, she should lose her guaranty, and be only the witness to antiquity. Yet so much must the *Critic* pretend, by boasting that the Catholic "gives to the existing Church the ultimate infallible decision in matters of saving faith . . . and the Anglican to antiquity, giving authority to the Church as being the witness and voice . . . of antiquity." What that antiquity held, we hold, for *it* could not acknowledge any authority but the *existing* Church.

Moreover, the High Church principle only removes the difficulties of Protestantism, or as the divines prefer calling it, of *ultra-Protestantism* another step; but it does not obviate them completely. Antiquity, as deposited in the writings of the early ages, is a dead letter as much as the Bible: it requires a living interpreter, no less. It has its obscurities, its perplexities, its apparent contradictions as much; it requires a guide no less to conduct us through its mazes. It cannot step in and decide between conflicting opinions and rival claims; it can, at most, be a code which requires a judge to apply it. It is more voluminous, more complex, more uncompact than Scripture; it needs more some methodizing and harmonizing, authoritative expounder. If national Churches can separately fulfil these offices, and sufficiently discharge these duties, they surely ought not to come to contradictory conclusions. Yet the Anglican stands in stark opposition to every other Episcopal Church throughout the world; its own daughter in America excepted.

And yet narrow as are the limits of this Church, its principle of faith has not secured to it the blessing which should be its destined result, a steadfast unity of belief among its members.

We speak not merely of the prevalence of dissent, but of the vast differences which the controversies, treated of in this article, have shown to exist between the members of the Anglican Church. The *British Critic* proposes a synod of that Church, as the best means of settling its present difficulties. Once more we say; let it be called, and we shall see how the Kebles and the Russells, the Newmans and the Arnolds, the Puseys and the Bickersteths, will agree in defining the first principle of faith, the ground on which all other controversies should be decided.

At the same time, comprehensive, nay, vast as is the pale of Catholicity, and embracing, as it does, every zone, and every quarter of the globe, let a council be called of its pastors, and you would see how differently *its* rule has attained the end of its existence, in the universal harmony it has produced in belief and practice. There you might interrogate a Bishop from New Spain, or a Vicar Apostolic from Sweden, a professor of the Sorbonne, or a country curate from the Abruzzi; you might consult the catechism taught to the child in Ireland, or to the native convert in the Philippine Islands, without discovering any wavering or hesitation on the question of church authority, or on any doctrine by it defined.

And by this comparison, it may be seen how in the Catholic Church the manifestation of the Son of Man, and the living Word of the Father, is, "as the lightning which cometh out of the east, and shineth even into the west," one single, indivisible and unsearchable blaze of light, pervading the entire heaven of human intelligence, from hemisphere to hemisphere. But if, on the one hand, when we are told, "Lo! he is in the desert," in camp-meetings and fields, preachings and revivals, amidst the mad exuberance of ultra-Protestant zeal, "we go not forth;" so, on the other, we hope to be pardoned if, on being modestly assured that "he is in the secret chambers" of one or two colleges in Oxford, where alone his doctrines may be had in their purity, "we believe it not."*

There is one point on which we fully agree with the *Critic*, and as it forms the beginning of his article, so it shall form the conclusion of ours. In common with many recent writers, he is of opinion that the controversies between our two Churches are only now fairly commencing. He thinks justly, that hitherto we have been assailed "rather by the power of the civil sword than by the arguments of divines." (p. 374.) The privilege of even attacking has been till now all on the other side, and we have been condemned, as a caste, to the ignobler labours of apology

* Matt. xxiv. 24, 26.

and defence. The staff of the oppressor hath now, however, been broken, we stand upon more equal ground, and it is our own fault if we follow not up our advantages. If the battle, of reason, we mean, and argument, has now to be fought, we, at least, will not steal away from the field; our habits and feelings would suggest another course, and prompt us, like Tasso's shepherd, to seek seclusion from the war, in the humbler task of our own improvement, or of mere domestic duties. But there are times when every citizen is a soldier, in the spiritual as in civil warfare; and a crisis like this is one. The course which we shall pursue shall be consistent and persevering. We seek not the wealth of our Anglican neighbours, nor their establishment, nor their political power, nor their usurped influence. All these things we esteem as dross. But we covet their brotherhood in the faith, and their participation in our security of belief and their being bound to us in cords of love, through religious unity. For these things, we will contend, unceasingly, and to the utmost of our power; and GOD DEFEND THE RIGHT!

-
- ART. IV.—1. *Report on the Civil Government of Canada*, 1828.
2. *Petition of the House of Assembly of Lower Canada for a Redress of Grievances*. March, 1834.
3. *Petition (the Second) from the Assembly of Lower Canada*. December, 1834. *With explanatory Remarks* (by H. S. Chapman). March, 1835.
4. *Existing Difficulties of the Government of the Canadas*. By J. A. Roebuck, M.P. 1836.
5. *The last Session of the Provincial Parliament of Lower Canada*. By E. B. O'Callaghan, M.P. April, 1836.
6. *Petition (the third) from the House of Assembly of Lower Canada*. 1836.
7. *Seventh Report of the Committee on Grievances (Upper Canada.)* Toronto. 1835.
8. *Canadiana; or, Sketches of Upper Canada: and the Political Crisis*. By W. B. Wells, Esq., Member of the Parliament of U. C. 1837.
9. *Reports of the Commissioners to Lower Canada*. 1837.
10. *The "Times" Newspaper of the 7th and 9th of March, and April 15th. "Debates on Canada."*

THE Canadian question has more than ordinary claims on the attention of the liberal Irish reader: first, from the great similarity of the evils which pervade the government of

both countries; next, from the vast number of the people of Ireland who not merely seek, but who actually find a home in that colony; and lastly, from the fact, that the dispute involves one of the most interesting and important questions in the science, of government which has ever agitated the public mind—we mean the constitution,—and perhaps even the existence of a second legislative chamber.

The Canadas, like Ireland, have long been handed over to the domination of a cruel and vindictive oligarchy—"a miserable minority"—which would be contemptible without its English bayonets. In Ireland, the ruling few have found sympathy with the imperial government by means of a similarity of religious belief. In Lower Canada, the same end has been attained, with much more advantage to the local oligarchy, by means of a similarity of language. In Ireland, the governed masses differ from their oppressors in religious belief (in language they can scarcely be said to differ any longer). in Canada, the religious difference exists also; but the local oligarchy were not slow to perceive that similarity of religion was a bond of union between two sections of the population, namely, the French Canadians and the Irish,—hence that source of difference was rendered wholly inapplicable to their object, and similarity of language was erected into a source of sympathy with the government, with the hope of entrapping the Irish and Americans to the side of the oligarchy. But the scheme failed. Although religion in the one country, and language in the other, may be, as in fact they are, the bond of sympathetic union between the dominant few and the imperial government; we shall hereafter see that a *desire for self-government* is the only bond which unites the people of all origins in the Canadian provinces.

Impressed then with a sense of the great importance of coming to a right decision on this subject, it is our intention, in the following pages, to examine the character of the civil government of those provinces, to exhibit the present state of popular opinion there, and to ascertain if the remedies demanded by the Canadians be adequate to the removal of the evils complained of, and to the permanent establishment of good government; and lastly, to exhibit the character of the measure lately introduced into the House of Commons by Lord John Russell.

The present Constitutions of Upper and Lower Canada owe their existence to the 31st Geo. III. c. 31, commonly called the "*Canadian Constitutional Act.*"

Previous to passing the act in question, the whole of Canada was comprised in one province, called the "*Province of Quebec;*" and was governed by a governor and council appointed by the

crown, according to the provisions of the 14th Geo. III. c. 83, called the "Quebec Act."

The changes effected by the 31st Geo. III. c. 31, were, *first*, the division of the province of Quebec into two provinces, of Upper and Lower Canada; the first being inland, and the last towards the sea: and, *second*, the establishment of two constitutions, alleged to be perfect copies or imitations of that which has so often been alleged to be inimitable,—namely, the British Constitution.

According to the Canadian Constitutions thus established, the legislative power is vested in, *first*, a governor, whose assent is necessary to the making a law; and who, contrary to the practice of the mother country, not unfrequently withholds his assent. *Second*: a Legislative Council or Second Chamber, chosen by the crown for life. *Third*: a House of Assembly, which represents the people much more completely than the British House of Commons, as the franchise is sufficiently low to include nearly every male inhabitant of mature age.

The administrative power is vested in the governor, as head of the executive, aided by an executive council, having duties somewhat similar to those of our privy-council; the chief duty being to advise with the governor in all matters where two or more heads are conceived to be better than one.

The judiciary consists of a chief justice and three judges at Quebec, a similar establishment at Montreal; with one judge for the district of Three Rivers, another for St. Francis, and a third for Gaspé. These hold courts of original jurisdiction, from the judgments of which there is an appeal to a higher court, formed of the governor and executive council, with an associated judge, who has not heard the case in the courts below. The judges are all appointed—not during good behaviour—but during the pleasure of the crown; which, in practice, means the pleasure of the local oligarchy, of which they form a part.

From the judgment of this court of appeal, there is a further appeal to the king in council.*

In order to understand the real nature and operation of the Canadian Constitution, as above briefly described, it is necessary to take a near view of the materials of which the two branches of the legislature are composed. We shall begin with the councils.

If the reader will take the trouble to turn to the debate which

* In Upper Canada a court of appeal has never been organised, so that appeals from the decisions of the courts of original jurisdiction, are direct to the king in council.

took place in the House of Commons on the Canadian Constitutional Act—a debate memorable for the quarrel between Burke and Fox—he will find, that the object of the minister, in erecting the legislative councils, was to form an aristocracy in each of the Canadas, so as to make the imitation of the British model as perfect as possible. Mr. Pitt even contemplated the subsequent introduction of hereditary titles,—but this folly (though authorised by the 31st Geo. III. c. 31, sec. 6) has never been attempted. But the formation of an aristocracy in Canada was not so easy a matter. At the time of the passing of the act, there did not exist any materials out of which an aristocracy could be formed; besides which, the social state of the people did not favour the accomplishment of so splendid a design, as the friends of the act appear to have contemplated.

Previous to the conquest, it is possible that materials for the manufacture of a colonial aristocracy might have been found. The seigneurs were for the most part members of the *noblesse* of France, to whom the people looked up with respect; and the Château de St. Louis, at Quebec, was filled with scions of the same class, attracted thither by the numerous good things which the mimic court had to bestow. The bar was also on the same aristocratic footing as that of France; and the ecclesiastics were not then as they are now, men drawn from and sympathizing with the masses, but were for the most part importations from the aristocratic Gallican Church.

The mass of the people too, at that time, had not tasted of the sweets of self-government, even of the imperfect and inadequate kind since introduced among them. They had not been called upon to exercise the duties of jurors as they have since been. The business of election was to them wholly unknown. Hence, being ignorant of these things, they had no objection to the existence of a class holding power not derived from themselves.

The first fruit of the conquest was the extinction of this natural aristocracy as some delight to call it; the next was the rendering the people indisposed towards an aristocracy of any kind.

Such of the ancient *noblesse* as had the means, returned soon after the conquest to old France; while such as remained, being no longer preferred to offices of trust and profit about the local government, were compelled to live as best they could upon their country estates. Among the honest, hardy, and cheerful farmers of Lower Canada, we still find names having the aristocratic mark of *de*,—the possessors of which have now nothing to distinguish them from their neighbours; and are, moreover, quite unconscious of their original dignity.

The persons whom the conquest found in power, persons intimately connected with the aristocracy of France, were, as may be imagined, speedily displaced, in order to make room for such of the "king's ancient subjects" as deemed themselves to have a claim upon the first fruits of conquest. There was accordingly a very general dismissal of the incumbents of office, and a substitution of persons drawn from the ranks of the conquerors, to fill the various offices in the country.

"Few of these persons," says a contemporary writer,* "were of a respectable class in the provinces whence they had emigrated; and their deportment in their new dignity did not much serve to alleviate the grief and chagrin of the discarded French *noblesse*, who felt themselves not less disgraced by their own dismissal, than by the elevation of such men into their seats. There were few or none of these 'ancient subjects' who had landed property in Canada. They had been either suttlers to the troops or Indian traders; and although those who were appointed magistrates now added *Esquire* to their names, they did not think fit to lay aside their former occupations. Indeed, such as were removed to a considerable distance from Quebec, found a way of rendering their magisterial powers useful in their trade; for, as the law was in their own hands, they took the liberty of moulding it to any form that suited their purpose. The Canadians had, in the course of their dealings, contracted debts with these and other traders, expecting to pay in peltry, or the produce of their farms, when the season came round; but, to their utter astonishment, they found themselves cited before the magistrates for the most trifling sums. Condemned to make instant payment, at times when they had no means in their power, and on failure thereof, their persons were arrested, dragged from their farms and families, and committed to a common prison, there to remain until their creditors received satisfaction for their demands. If the debt exceeded forty shillings, their case was still worse; for then they were arrested by the writ of the Court of Quebec, and from the remotest part of the province, transmitted, under custody of a deputy marshall, like felons, to the capital. As by the French laws, no process went against the person of the debtor until his chattels were found insufficient, and of these he was allowed time to make the most, at the proper season, by the merciful decree of his seigneur, it is difficult to conceive the misery and distress in which the poor Canadians found themselves involved by the operation of these new and unknown laws; and when to the afflicting circum-

stances we have already stated, we add the enormous expense attending a process out of the Superior Court, executed at so great a distance, we shall cease to wonder that the Canadians are not in raptures with the English laws of arrest, and be less amazed at the obstinate prejudice they entertain for their own laws and customs."

These "suttlers" and "Indian traders" then were the chief materials for the formation of an aristocracy, introduced after the cession of Canada in 1763. The process by which the destruction of the French aristocracy was effected, is thus described by a Canadian writer:—"The English introduced among the population a spirit of traffic; they taught them to appreciate the advantages of individual wealth, and to feel that a man might be of importance although not descended from a noble race. The English traders spread themselves over the country, bartered and trafficked with the inhabitants, introducing new articles of luxury, and creating a demand for the various productions of the country. The *bourgeois*, or ignoble inhabitants of the towns, caught the spirit; laboured, and laboured successfully, to accumulate wealth for themselves,—and being a frugal and prudent race, they quickly found themselves possessed of fortunes more than sufficient to enable them to cope with the broken-down *noblesse* around them. They, therefore, began immediately to compete with this fading generation, both in political and social life."*

The result of deprivation of office, united with the competition of the *bourgeoisie*, may easily be conceived. The new men became wealthy and powerful, whilst the *noblesse*, who disdained traffic, became miserably poor. Another cause of the decay of the *ancienne noblesse* was their neglect of the education of their children, whilst the *bourgeoisie*, having themselves acquired riches, sought out for the means of imparting instruction to their children; "by means of the seminaries of the province, their children received a fair and useful education, by, and of, the priesthood,—and were thus enabled to surpass their noble competitors in knowledge, as their fathers had before surpassed them in wealth." In this manner the only body of men bearing any the smallest resemblance to old-country aristocracies was completely and for ever swept away, and the authors of the Constitutional Act thus deprived of the means of realizing their golden anticipations.

To the "suttlers" and "Indian traders," described in the

* See "A Political and Historical Account of Lower Canada." By a Canadian. London, 1830.

first extract, and the enriched *bourgeoisie*, described in the second, another class of materials for a pseudo-aristocracy must be added, consisting of the banished officials and other "loyalists," as they delighted to call themselves, from the Old Colonies, after the declaration of independence in 1776. These persons, having by their representations been the chief instigators of the obnoxious measures adopted by the mother country with a view to coerce the United Colonies, were, of course, compelled to seek their safety in flight, the moment the oppressed colonists were driven to open resistance. They very naturally sought an asylum in the colonies which remained, where, by a continued clamour about their sufferings and loyalty, by a claim to compensation for the losses which they were supposed to have sustained, and a reward for their adherence to the "loyal" side in a quarrel which they had really been the chief means of generating for their own selfish purposes, they soon succeeded in obtaining a large share of such offices as became vacant, or were created, in the province of Quebec. In this manner the classes we have mentioned, differing from each other only in the way in which they were respectively called into existence, united to form a kind of petty local oligarchy, who shared, with some few scions of the English aristocracy, nearly all the administrative, judicial, and legislative offices, including the Council of Quebec, established under the acts of 1774.

When the Constitutional Act of 1791 was carried into operation, the Legislative Council was necessarily chosen out of the above class; in fact, there was no other class out of which an "aristocratic branch" of the legislature could be chosen. The Executive Council, a kind of permanent privy-council, to advise the governor, was nothing more than the old Council of Quebec under a new name. The members of this council had the ear of the governor; and, as their advice has generally been taken in the filling-up of appointments, as their influence over each succeeding governor has been great, they have of course contributed more than any other body to the perpetuation of power in the hands of the local oligarchy,—in other words, their own class.

To detail the manner in which this perpetuation of official power has worked, up to the present day, in both the Canadas, would require a very large space indeed; we shall therefore content ourselves by exhibiting some of the most striking mischiefs, giving the preference to those for which we have warrant in parliamentary documents.

In 1833 and 1834, Mr. Hume, to whose exertions in the cause of good colonial government, Canada, especially the Upper

Province, is greatly indebted, moved for the production of certain papers relative to the Legislative Councils of the two provinces. These important papers* form the ground-work of the statements which we are about to make, aided by some of the works at the head of this article.

The Legislative Council of Lower Canada consists of about thirty-five members; of these a very large majority consist of persons belonging to the official or *bureaucratic* party, as it is called in the town province. The minority, "coinciding with the views of the Assembly," does not exceed five or six persons, who were introduced evidently for the purpose of making a show of carrying into effect the recommendation of the Canada Committee of 1828, that popular persons should be introduced into the Council. Among the members of the Council are several lucrative place-holders. The Chief-Justice is a member, so also are two or three of the judges. These last have not attended of late; but there they are, having the legal right to sit, and ready to attend the moment their presence may be of vital importance to their class. Besides these, there are some members of the Executive Council, the Bishop, the Commissioner of Crown Lands (an alleged delinquent under suspension), the Receiver-General, an ex-receiver-general (*a proved delinquent*), the Commissioner of the Jesuits' estates, and some others.

The Executive Council consists of eight members, six of whom hold office, and two are legislative Councillors. But, as if all this were not enough to beget a perfect identity of interest between the two Councils, there is a sort of mutual accommodation in the way of appointing clerks. Two of the members of the Legislative Council are clerks of the Executive Council, whilst two executive Councillors are clerks of the Legislative Council.

In Upper Canada this monstrous state of things exists with equal force, but with some few modifications of detail, which it is not necessary to enter into in this place: suffice it to say, that the oligarchy is of an equally odious character in both provinces.

The nest-feathering propensities of these official personages require now to be exhibited. In Lower Canada the Chief Justice and his family actually swallow up about one-thirtieth part of the whole revenue of the province. The following is a list of the family and the offices they hold:—

* See Sessional Papers, No. 433, 25th June, 1833, and No. 149, 24th March, 1834.

1. Jonathan Sewell, Chief Justice	- -	£1,500	
Ditto, Speaker of the Legislative Council		900	
Ditto, Circuits	- - - -	50	
2. Wm. T. Sewell, Sheriff, son of No. 1		1,500	or 2000
3. Edward Sewell, son of No. 1, Missionary		200	or more
4. John Sewell, son of No. 1, Usher of the			
Black Rod	- - - -	180	
Ditto, Postmaster	- - - -	400	
5. Henry Sewell, son of No. 1, Reading			
Clerk of the Legislative Council	-	200	
6. Montague Sewell, son of No. 1, Extra			
Writing Clerk to the Legislative			
Council	- - - -	100	

No. 5 succeeded his brother Robert, who died. There is yet another son to be provided for; the grand-sons of No. 1—the sons of Nos. 2 and 3—who are married, will require the fostering *grand*-parental aid of this prince of official nest-feathers.

We shall not trouble the reader with any other list from Lower Canada; suffice it to say, it might be swelled with the Smiths and the Bowens, and the Coffins, and the Cochrans (one of whom enjoys four or five paid offices), all well known Colonial names.

Let us now exhibit a sample from the sister province:—

1. D'Arcy Boulton, sen., a retired pensioner	£500
2. D'Arcy Boulton, jun., son of No. 1, Auditor-General	unknown
3. William, son of No. 1, Church Missionary and Professor of King's College	650
4. George, son of No. 1, Registrar of North-umberland	unknown

(Another son, Henry, was Attorney-General with about 2,500*l.* a year,* but was deprived of his office by Lord Ripon. He is now Chief Justice of Newfoundland, where his conduct has created universal disgust.)

5. John Beverly Robinson, son-in-law of No. 1, Chief Justice and Speaker of the Council	2,066
6. Peter, brother to No. 5, Commissioner of Crown-lands, Executive Councillor, &c.	750
7. William, brother to the above, Postmaster of Newmarket	unknown
8. Jonas Jones, son-in-law to No. 1, Judge of three District Courts, with other offices	1000

9. Alpheus Jones, brother of No. 8, Collector of Customs at Prescott—Postmaster -	900
10 and 11. Two other Jones's holding offices, the incomes of which are - -	unknown
12. Levius Sherwood, brother-in-law to the Jones's,—Judge - - - -	1000
13, 14, and 15. Three other Sherwoods, all holding offices, but whose incomes are	unknown.

This list might be swelled to upwards of forty individuals all in some way either directly or indirectly connected with each other. A writer on Canada observes :—

“ This family connexion rules Upper Canada according to its own good pleasure, and has no efficient check from England to guard the people against its acts of tyranny and oppression. It includes the whole of the Judges of the Supreme, Civil, and Criminal Tribunals—all active Tory politicians. It includes half the Executive Council, or Provincial Cabinet.

“ It includes the Speaker and eight other Members of the Legislative Council.

“ It includes the persons who have the controul of the Canada Company's monopoly.

“ It includes the President and Solicitor of the Bank, and above half the Bank Directors; together with shareholders, holding, to the best of my recollection, about 1,800 shares.”—*M'Kenzie's Sketches of Upper Canada*. Wilson, p. 409.

The manner in which the members of the Canadian oligarchy procure large grants of land will be well exhibited by the following case :

Wm. B. Felton - - - -	14,141 acres.
<i>Children of Ditto.</i>	
William	1000 acres.
Eliza -	1200
Charlotte	1200
Fanny	1200
Maria -	1200
Matilda	1200
Louisa -	1200
Octavia	1200

23,541

It would puzzle any one to discover what service Miss Fanny, or Miss Matilda, or Miss Octavia, an infant at the time of the grant, had rendered to the people of Lower Canada, that they should be thus rewarded out of what should be the chief resource of a new country.

Among the official persons thus possessed of the governing power, the most perfect irresponsibility prevails. No delinquency, however atrocious, meets with punishment. The public robber is not merely screened from justice, but the mere fact of a public accusation is sufficient to render the object of it a mark for honours and consideration from his class. The person above named, Felton, was proved to have procured some 8000 or 10,000 acres of his land by fraud and deception, and so clear was the case that it became impossible for the government to screen him. Nevertheless, his compeers regarded him as unfortunate, not criminal. They are, in fact, in open war against society in Canada, and a case of detection excites their sympathy not their condemnation. They regard him as a band of pickpockets regard a detected fellow, merely as being "in trouble." If they have a feeling at all disadvantageous to the delinquent, it is similar to that of the Spartan boys. A*Sir John Caldwell, some few years since, when Receiver-General, got in arrear to the extent of several hundred thousand dollars (the debt amounted in 1835 to 600,000); that he was deficient was long suspected by the Assembly, but he was protected by the Governor Dalhousie, on the plea that he was not the officer of the Assembly, but of the Crown; and, therefore, the Assembly had nothing to do with the matter. At length there was not money to pay some small warrant, although there ought to have been more than 100,000*l.* in the chest; hence an *exposé* was necessary. The Assembly now reminded the Governor of his plea: "He is the officer of the Crown," said they, "therefore the Crown must bear the loss;" but the argument was not intended to cut two ways. The people have never had redress, and the delinquent ex-receiver has been ever since one of the brightest ornaments of the mimic Court of the Château de St. Louis.

In most cases where a delinquent official is to be screened from punishment the local oligarchy has the support of the Colonial Office, but the cases are numerous in which protection has been extended to a delinquent or obnoxious official even by the Governor himself, in direct opposition to the Colonial Office. The following is a most striking case:—

In 1834, the Governor, Lord Aylmer, appointed, as *puisné* Judge, a person named Gale, who had rendered himself extremely obnoxious to the people of Canada as the violent partizan of Lord Dalhousie. The second petition complains "that the sacred character of justice had been polluted in its source by the appointing to the high office of Judge of the King's Bench for the district of Montreal, a violent and decided partizan of the administration of the Earl of Dalhousie, and the declared enemy of the laws he is sworn to administer." This Gale came to

England in 1827, and gave evidence marked by such bitter animosity towards the people of Canada, that it was generally understood a mark was set against his name at the Colonial Office. This, at all events, is certain, that Mr. Rice, when Colonial Minister, refused to allow the appointment. Now let the reader mark the conduct of Lord Aylmer, backed by the whole official class. The official dispatch of Mr. Rice was sent to Lord Aylmer just before the Whigs went out of office. It was forwarded by the Post-office packet from Falmouth. The news of the Tories being again in power went out by the New York packet. Now it so happens that the government conveyance is usually some three weeks behind the New York packet-ships,—it would be undignified on the part of a government packet to emulate the hurry of a vulgar trader. Hence, at the time Lord Aylmer received Mr. Rice's commands, it is more than probable that he was aware of the change of ministry, and the wily Lord hesitated not to disobey the orders of his fallen master. Lord Aberdeen of course approved of the above conduct, and Mr. Gale continued to enjoy the office.

When the Whigs again came into power the Colonists began to felicitate themselves with the idea that Mr. Rice's dispatch would be at once fulfilled. But they were doomed to be disappointed; the government, with what appears to us an unaccountable want of dignity, remained quiescent, and the obnoxious judge is still upon the bench.

We shall not at this moment distract the reader by continuing an enumeration of the manifold acts of insolence of which the officials are constantly guilty, not merely towards the people of Canada, but towards the Imperial Government; but shall proceed to the consideration of the most potent evil springing out of the legislative power possessed by this party.

The Legislative Council—the mimic House of Lords—the Canadian second Legislative Chamber, is, as we have seen, composed almost entirely of the official party, without the most indirect or remote responsibility to the people, and having but small sympathy with them. The Assembly, on the other hand, is the people's house, not merely *nominally*, but substantially, representing the masses by a suffrage really and practically universal. This franchise is conferred by the possession of a forty-shilling freehold, and where one hundred acres of land can be had in the seigneuries by *asking for it*, and in the townships for an instalment of five pounds, no man of full age need be without the franchise. The consequence of this extensive suffrage, united with the social equality of the people, is that the Assembly of Lower Canada is essentially a democratic body—

more so, perhaps, than any one of the representative Houses of the individual States of the Union. Can a house so constituted possibly agree with a Legislative Council which is merely the stronghold of a band of irresponsible officials? Evidently not. There must be perpetual disagreement between the two branches of the Canadian legislature.

And how does this disagreement between the Council and the Assembly make itself manifest? In the same way that disagreement occasionally rears its head between the Commons and the Lords of this, the mother country—by the rejection by the Council of measures which have been passed by the Assembly in obedience to the wishes of the people,

The pamphlet entitled "The Last Session of the Provincial Parliament of Lower Canada," which we have placed the fifth on our list, exhibits a frightful example of the "obstructive" character of the Canadian Legislative Council. In fourteen years the number of bills passed by the Assembly, and rejected by the Council, was no less than *two hundred and sixteen*, besides which, *eighty-six* were so altered as to insure their final rejection by the Assembly. This makes no less than *three hundred and two* bills lost in fourteen years, in consequence of the obstructive character of the Legislative Council. Speaking of the Session 1835-6, the author of the pamphlet just quoted, a member of the Lower Canadian Assembly, says:—

"Of 107 Bills sent up to the Council, thirty-four, or nearly one-third of the whole, have never been heard of; and fifteen have been so amended as to be rendered utterly useless, if not worse than useless. Thus nearly one-half a session of five months' continuance has been entirely destroyed, and the great expense of money and time which has been incurred by a protracted session, rendered utterly fruitless by what has now become a *systematic rejection* of measures required for the public benefit.

"If, on the other hand, we examine the labours of the Legislative Council, what is the most startling feature that strikes us? In a session of one hundred and forty-seven days that body produced *six* Bills, one of which was to amend a road act, and the other—worthy offspring of such a parent!—to repress *charivaris*! *

"It is true that during this period they were not idle; they were busy destroying nearly one half of the bills which the people's representatives had just passed; thus, in the words of Neilson's Quebec Gazette in 1827, 'turning against the country the power with which they were invested for its benefit.' Thus affording an incontestible proof of unfitness for their trust, and of how strong is the necessity which exists of stripping them of their power, and disabling them, as we would public enemies, from perpetrating public mischief."—*The Late Session, &c.* p. 3.

* The *Charivari* is a sort of marrow-bone and cleaver row in masquerade.

It would be quite impossible for us to enumerate the various bills of a beneficial character which have met with destruction at the ruthless hands of the evil-working Council; we shall, therefore, instance only a few of the most prominent.

The Canadian Assemblies are fond of assimilating their laws and institutions, as nearly as suits the circumstances of the country, and habits of the people, to British laws and customs. With this view they have repeatedly passed a bill to compel a member who shall accept an office under the Crown to go back to his constituents. This, our readers must agree, is a very salutary measure, yet the Council has always rejected it.

Another case in point was, "a bill for the better securing the freedom of elections, by the removal of troops from the places at which such elections shall be held." In both the Canadas the constitution-loving Englishman will be both astonished and disgusted by seeing armed troops paraded in the cities within sight of the polling-booths, and mixing among the voters as they proceed to the poll. In 1832, in the middle of the day, without any disturbance to justify such a proceeding, the people were fired on by the troops, by the order of a cowardly and cruel magistrate of the Council party. The Assembly very naturally desire to prevent a similar proceeding, and more especially to prevent a spurious return by means of armed intimidation. But the Council naturally attaches enormous value to the English bayonets generally, and especially as regards their "legitimate influence" at an election; hence the bill is regularly rejected. For the education of the people the Assembly has always shown itself duly solicitous. Its struggle against the Council on this score dates from a very early period. Various unsuccessful efforts had been made by the Assembly to establish elementary schools on the Scotch system, and especially in 1814, when a bill was introduced to give the people of the several parishes the power of assessing themselves, and of appointing trustees; but the Council interposed its blighting *veto*, and the children of Canada remained untaught. "Numbers of bills," says the author of the pamphlet which stands the fifth on our list, "to establish schools in the province were introduced after this, and rejected by the same Council, who would have no other act than the proselyting act of 1831, and the Royal Institution." (p. 12.)

In 1829, however, by dint of the most indomitable perseverance, the Assembly did procure the passing of an elementary school bill, and great indeed was the joy of the people. The same year 14,753 scholars were taught at these schools, and in 1835 they had increased to 37,658. Forseeing that, as the system worked, the act would require continual amendments, it

was unfortunately, as it happened, not made permanent, and in 1836 the Council would not renew it or substitute any other act for it. It consequently expired, and in one day upwards of 1,600 schools were shut up, and more than 40,000 scholars deprived of the blessing of education. The liberal newspapers came out on the day on which the act expired clothed in the insignia of woe. Such are the acts of a party whose perpetual outcry is, that the Catholic religion is the enemy of education !

Sometimes the interference of the Council is of the most paltry kind, as in the case following:—At the present time, barristers hold their commissions *during the pleasure of the crown* ; and they pay a fee of three guineas for it. The Assembly, wishing to amend this, passed a bill abolishing the above tenure, and reducing the fee to a trifle. The bill was never heard of when it got into the Council, “ It touched the pockets of the office-holders, by diminishing their fees ; and, as the council protect the office-holders against the people, and not the people against the office-holders, the bill was naturally thrown out.”

We shall pursue these details no farther. We have gone quite far enough to show that agreement between two distinct legislative chambers, composed of such opposite elements as those of Lower Canada, is and ever must be out of the question. The commons' house is essentially a democratic chamber ; the interests of its members are perfectly identical with those of the people, of which, indeed, they are a part. The members of the Council, on the other, have, or, what amounts to the same thing, fancy they have, interests opposed to the people. Hence they oppose themselves to the people as a governing oligarchy.

In this country we are beginning to experience the inconvenience of a second chamber so constituted as to have interests opposed to the Commons' branch. If our House of Commons were as completely democratic as the Canadian Assembly, what, in the language of party, is called *collision*, would be much more frequent than it now is. Before the passing of the Reform Bill, collision, as we now understand it, was never heard of. And why was it not ? Simply because the two houses had interests in common. The peers and their families returned, or rather nominated, a full majority of the House of Commons, so that the latter was wholly an aristocratic body,—a branch, in fact, of the upper chamber, under another name, the members being not necessarily endowed with titles. The Reform Act, though it did not destroy the aristocratic character of the house, introduced a new element, which so far altered the general tone of

that body, as to render it impossible for the party which sympathized with the upper house to carry on the government. Hence the party which had always, when out of power, professed some sympathy for the people, became possessed of the government; and, although their legislation has not been of a character to give unqualified satisfaction to the people, it has been extremely distasteful to the peers, and a collision has been the result. As the people obtain a greater degree of controul over the Commons' house—and obtain it they will—collision will become more frequent, and of a more serious character, until at length it will be impossible to carry on the business of legislation. The constitution will stop, and we shall witness a similar struggle to that which has so long prevailed in Canada—a struggle between the two branches of the legislature, the lower house embodying the opinions and wishes of the governed many; the upper, those of the ruling few;—a struggle, in short, between the two adverse principles of democracy and aristocracy.

We have no hesitation in saying that the real nature of the British constitution is generally much better understood in Lower Canada than in the mother country. In this country, it required the acute philosophy of a Bentham, to sift from the complicated mass called the constitution the true rationale of the harmonious working of the whole. It was to corruption alone that the boasted harmony was owing. In Lower Canada corruption never forced her way within the hallowed precincts of the Commons' house; hence the defective working of the machine made every one practically acquainted with its true nature. Mr. Bentham's *Fragment on Government* was published in 1776. One would almost suppose that the Canadian constitution of 1791 was intended to prove the soundness of that great and good man's views. As we must necessarily return to this constitutional point when we come to notice the recent debates in parliament, we shall content ourselves in this place with mentioning that the Assembly and people of Lower Canada regard the Council as the stronghold of corruption,—as acting as a "screen" (this is Lord Stanley's expression) between the people and the Imperial Government,—as being "at the root of all the evils (another phrase of Lord Stanley's) under which the people of Lower Canada have so long groaned;" and they have, therefore, repeatedly prayed, "that the Legislative Council, as at present constituted, be abolished, and that the people of this province be empowered to elect the second branch of the legislature in future, as the only means of producing that

harmony, without which internal peace and good government cannot exist."—*Petition (second) of 1834*, p. 10.

Persons who are interested in misrepresenting the Canadians, are in the habit of alluding to the long list of grievances—the ninety-two resolutions, *each a grievance*,—of which the Canadians demand redress. It is here necessary to state that the people of Canada do not demand the redress of each specific grievance; they demand the power of remedying their grievances. Formerly, before their political education was much better than that of an English shopocrat or a French *épiciér*, they did fall into the error of demanding the redress of each specific grievance; but they soon found that this plan would only involve disappointment,—that it would amount to a perpetuation of bad government. They perceived, that if the evil-working system were permitted to remain, a new crop of grievances would spring up as fast as those existing at any given time were removed. A demand consequently arose among them for a change of the system; and they now quote grievances merely as so many illustrations of the abominable and vicious system of which they seek the removal.

It may be here proper to mention, that they were probably led into this enlightened course by a most able article which appeared in the *Westminster Review* for July 1827, in which the Legislative Council was pointed out to be the source of the misgovernment, and, consequently, the object upon which the Canadians should make their attacks. This article is well known to have been written by Mr. Roebuck, and it certainly gave a new turn to the views of the leading Canadians. Mr. Roebuck recommended the total abolition of the Council; but, from motives of policy, or, perhaps, from a habit of regarding the institutions of the United States as the foster parent of happiness, the demand of the Canadians has hitherto been for an elective council similar to those which existed in the old colonies, under the charters granted by the House of Stuart. In the evidence of Mr. John Neilson, one of the Canadian delegates, in 1828, we find an elective council recommended as a remedy for the then existing discontent. From that time forward it became the theme of discussion in the colony: and in the early part of 1834 it became the subject of the prayer of the Assembly in their petition to the imperial parliament.

This is the great *radical* reform which the people of Canada wisely consider would enable them to take into their own hands reform in detail. There is no evil that presses upon them which a legislature in harmony would not be competent to remedy. The governor, the representative of the imperial government, it

is true, would still possess a veto; but the people feel, that when removed from the blighting influence of the local oligarchy, the governor would have no interest against the people: he would govern, with the Assembly, for the people, and the veto would be rarely exercised.

For this single reform, the Canadians would compromise all other considerations, would silence all other demands; but at present there are three evils of which they complain, and demand the removal, distinct from reform of the Council:—

1. They demand that they be protected from the constant seizure of their revenues by the local administration; and that the legal right of the Assembly to a perfect controul over expenditure be held inviolate.

2. They demand to be protected against the interference of the Imperial Government in their local affairs; and that the Tenures Act and the Land Company's Charter, which are gross cases of such undue interference, be repealed.

3. They demand complete parliamentary controul over the waste lands.

I. The history of the financial difficulties of Lower Canada presents some very remarkable features. When the Canadian legislature was first called together, the whole of the revenues of the province were placed by Lord Dorchester, the then governor, under the controul of the Assembly; and the claim which has been subsequently set up by the official party to a portion of the revenues, was an *after thought*, arising from a desire on the part of the said officials to render themselves independent of popular controul. During the first years of the Canadian Constitution, the local revenues were not sufficient for the expenditure, and there was a balance voted by the Imperial Parliament. Of this sum the local authorities had the controul; and, as the Assembly did not at first understand its own functions, all appeared tolerably quiet. In 1810, however, the provincial revenues had increased to a point sufficient for the expenditure, and the Assembly offered "to pay their own civil expenditure." Will the reader believe that this offer was treated by the official party as treasonable? The gentleman who made the proposal, Mr. Bedard, afterwards raised to the Bench, "a man distinguished for ability, singleness of heart, and a devoted attachment to constitutional principles, was, with some of his supporters, lodged in the common gaol for the district of Quebec." The Assembly, however, prevailed. They obtained the privilege of paying their own servants; and with it the power of controuling them. This was the sore point with the officials: they have

never got over it; and the whole of the financial difficulties which have subsequently occurred, have arisen solely out of the writhings and contortions of the officials to avoid responsibility, and to make themselves independent of the commons' house. In this effort they have unhappily been seconded by the Colonial Office.

The first scheme of the official party was to procure a vote of supplies *en bloc*, in a lump sum, with the intention of dividing it according to the approved English method,—the lion's share to the strongest. This scheme failed. They then demanded a permanent civil list. This also failed repeatedly, until the time of Lord Dalhousie, when the demand was changed for a civil list during the life of the king. This, said the officials, is the English custom, and all loyal people should love English customs. The officials forgot, however, that they told only *half the story* about English customs. In England the civil list is granted for life, in return for certain revenues which the king gives up. The officials said nothing about this return—this *quid pro quo*. This consideration being wanting, to have granted a permanent civil list would have robbed the Assembly of all power. It was accordingly refused; and the Assembly have ever since persisted in their demand to control expenditure.

Besides the schemes to avoid responsibility above enumerated, another plan of the officials has been to lay claim to certain revenues, pretending that they are the property of the crown, and not of the people. They laid claim, for instance, to certain duties, because they were called "crown duties," and were levied under the authority of an imperial statute. On this point, however, the Assembly succeeded in establishing their right, which was confirmed, *not created*, by a statute of the first year of the late reign. Foiled here, the official party continued to lay claim to what is called the casual and territorial revenue. But recently all these claims to partial revenues have been rendered unimportant by the seizure of the public revenues, and the payment of the officials, by the authority of the Colonial office.

II. The interference of the Imperial Government in matters purely local, has given the greatest possible disgust to the Assembly and people of Lower Canada. The Tenures Act was one of these. It was objected to as interfering with a large class of rights, such, for instance, as those of minors and married women, and producing the greatest possible disturbance and difficulty. If it were intended to render rights insecure, and to generate litigation, the act was certainly well contrived. The Canadians contend, that concerning so purely local a matter as

the tenure of land, with all its incidents, the Imperial Parliament is not competent to legislate. If legislation be attempted in ignorance, it must be fraught with error, and therefore with mischief; and it is for the reason that none but a local assembly can know aught of such purely local matters, that they demand a full recognition of the principle of non-interference.

The charter of the British American Land Company is another case of interference of which they complain. The Colonial Office, with an inexcusable disregard to the interests of the colony, transferred to the above company a large portion of the lands of Lower Canada for a mere trifle. Now, with good management, the lands of a new colony may be made to pay not merely all the civil expenses of the government, but also to provide means for educating the people, and of carrying on public improvements. By the improvident act of the Colonial Office, this source of revenue has been cut off, having been transferred from the people, to whom of right it belongs, to a set of rapacious speculators. The Assembly have formally demanded the repeal of this Act, and have declared, that not only will they never sanction the company, but that they will confiscate the lands of the company, whensoever they have the power.* The late Assembly of Upper Canada also carried a very strong resolution against the Upper Canada (Land) Company.

III. Control over the waste lands necessarily follows, as a demand, after that for the repeal of the above acts. The people of Canada perceive that the sale of the public lands would supersede taxation, whilst at present they are used by the executive as a means of corruption, and by the officials as an object of plunder. There is scarcely a single official personage who does not possess large domains. A specimen of this we have already given in the case of Felton.

We have now completed our picture of the state of misrule in Lower Canada, up to the time the people became convinced that the parent of the evil was the Legislative Council, as then and at present constituted. We have now to mark down the subsequent course of events.

We may here mention, that it has been objected against the Canadian Assembly that their animosity towards the Council is of recent date, and that the time was when they desired no such constitutional change as that which they now demand. This objection appears to us to be frivolous in the extreme. It is a

* The opposition of the Assembly has not been without its effect. The shares of the Company are at \$1., the sum paid in being \$162.

distinguishing feature of opinion, that it is progressive. This is especially conspicuous in England, where new demands for political changes, previously unheard of, spring up every day. A few years before the passing of the Reform Act, the disfranchisement of a few rotten boroughs, and the enfranchisement of a few large towns, would have satisfied the people for a time; now we are looking for most extensive reforms.

In the same way, it is quite true that the Canadians would have been satisfied, in 1836, with a reform which they would regard with scorn in 1837; and in 1837, with one which will fall far short of their advanced conceptions in 1838. In short, it seems that ministerial concession to revolted or discontented colonies is perpetually a little too late. The colonial minister of 1777-8 *conceded* the famous declaratory act; but the "States" were no longer within the reach of a British act of parliament; they had been coerced,—they had been forced into independence.

¹ In 1828, the Canadians hailed the recommendations of the Committee on the Civil Government of Canada as "an imperishable monument." They did so, because one of the recommendations was to introduce liberal and independent men into the Council by means of a creation. Some few were introduced; but what could they do among a host of enemies? They did nothing, except to prove that the "recommendations" had never been attended to, or that if they had been, the scheme, as a means of producing good government, had proved itself utterly abortive. And it is this experience which has helped them to the conviction that the council must be rendered elective.

Having come to this determination, let us see what method the Canadian Assembly has adopted to bring about this reform. They have taken the advice of Lord (then Mr.) Stanley; advice gravely addressed to them in 1829, when that right honourable person was a Whig out of place. They have petitioned the Imperial Parliament and the Crown, and have resorted to the constitutional practice of stopping supplies in order to enforce their demand for reform.

In 1834, whilst their demand for an elective council was before a committee of the House of Commons, and whilst supplies continued thus stopped, came Mr. Rice into office. At that time two delegates from Canada, the Hon. D. B. Viger and Mr. Morin, M.P.P., were in England. A meeting took place between those gentlemen, Mr. Roebuck, and Mr. Rice, on which occasion Mr. Rice declared that he would do nothing to prejudice their case, or to interfere with the position which

the Assembly had taken up. What was Mr. Rice's subsequent conduct? The reader will scarcely believe, that only seven days after this promise, Mr. Rice penned a dispatch authorizing the Governor Aylmer to pay the officials to the extent of 31,000/., out of the military chest; thus completely breaking down the position which the Assembly had assumed. Surely the inconvenience of the non-payment of the officials, however severe as individual hardship, was not a sufficient ground for interfering with the great principle which was at issue.

During the short administration of the Tories, Mr. Roebuck presented the second petition of the Assembly to the House of Commons, when Sir Robert Peel announced the notable expedient of a Royal Commissioner to be sent to Canada to enquire into grievances which had been already declared to exist by an Assembly (the highest authority which a country can possess) representing at least *eleven-twelfths* of the whole people. This was merely an expedient to create delay, and for all other purposes was absurd in a high degree. The new government, however, contrived to make it more so, by extending the commission from one to three persons, Lord Gosford, Sir Charles Grey, and Sir George Gipps, who reached Canada in the autumn of 1835, and remained in office till the beginning of the present year; Lord Gosford still remaining as governor.

What they did there may be learned in minute detail from Mr. Roebuck's pamphlet, quoted fourth at the head of this article, and also from their own reports. We can only find room for a general outline of the most important occurrences.

Before the commissioners left England, Mr. Roebuck, as agent to the Assembly, laid before Lord Glenelg a statement of the demands of that house. This statement was afterwards printed in Canada, by order, we believe, of the House of Assembly, and afterwards reprinted by Mr. Roebuck in the appendix to his pamphlet. The necessity for a radical change in the constitution of the Legislative Council is insisted upon; and Lord Glenelg is warned of the evil consequences of a denial of justice.

Mr. Roebuck's next step was to ask for a copy of the Instructions; but Sir Geo. Grey excused himself from laying them before parliament, on the plea that *respect for the Canadian Assembly* demanded that the instructions should first be communicated to that body. This was so plausible a reason that the demand could not be further pressed.

When the commissioners reached Canada, their conversation was wholly of "concession," and "liberality," and "reform." They were the "nominees of a reforming ministry." Lord

Gosford was "the friend of O'Connell." He was "convinced that his instructions would give satisfaction." The effect of this was that he met the Assembly enjoying its good will. A tolerably sure test of this is, that at that time he had the hatred of the colonial tories, whose papers abused him roundly; thus showing that members of the Assembly were not the only persons deceived by his professions.

When the meeting of the legislature took place, however, to the astonishment of the Canadians, no instructions were brought to light. The Governor's speech, though somewhat longer than common, dealt only in vague generalities, and was studiously silent on all the topics most interesting to the Canadians.

Disappointment and distrust were the necessary consequences of this unfortunate opening of the intercourse between the Assembly and the Executive, under the administration of Lord Gosford. As for the Commission, the Assembly never in any way condescended to notice it. From the Journals of the Assembly, it is very doubtful whether the future historian would be able to collect that such a commission has existed,—unless, indeed, Lord Gosford may charitably have rescued it from utter oblivion, by naming it in one of his Messages.

Finding, that notwithstanding the promise of Sir George Grey, the instructions had not been laid before the Assembly, Mr. Roebuck, on the 16th of Feb. 1836, again asked the Colonial Under-Secretary to produce them: but he again excused himself, on the ground that—"inasmuch as there was now a fair prospect of adjusting the differences between this country and Canada, he thought that while negotiations were pending, it would be extremely injudicious and might lead to great inconvenience, if the instructions given to the commissioners were to be made public." He also said, "that the House of Assembly had shown they were actuated by the most honest and ardent wish to promote the interests of the Colony." This is not very wonderful, seeing that they are "the Colony," and cannot have an interest against it. Upon this appeal, Mr. Roebuck, of course, withdrew his motion.

But the real nature of all these excuses, and the extraordinary conduct of the Colonial Office, were doomed to receive a complete exposure at the hands of one of its own creatures. Sir Francis Head had just succeeded Sir John Colborne as Lieutenant-Governor of Upper Canada,—and on meeting the Assembly of Upper Canada, he had accompanied his own Message with extracts from the instructions of Lord Glenelg to the Lower Canada Commissioners; and this, notwithstanding the "great inconvenience," the "extreme injudiciousness" of making the

instructions public, and the propriety of first laying them before the Lower Canada Assembly. After this "untoward" blunder, Lord Gosford was compelled, with an ill grace, to communicate a full copy of his instructions to the Assembly.

The object of Lord Gosford had evidently been to get a vote of supplies from the Assembly; and to affect this, every effort was made to generate an impression that the Imperial Government contemplated some great and important concession, and thus to lull the generally watchful suspicions of the Assembly: but his scheme failed. The exhibition of the non-conciliatory instructions shut the door to any thing like confidence on the part of the Assembly towards the Governor, and all arrears which otherwise might possibly have been voted, were immediately refused. And here the Assembly exhibited one of those remarkable acts of forbearance which we sometimes witness on the part of popularly constituted bodies. In order to prevent undue embarrassments to the executive, *they voted supplies for six months*; but so short an allowance was not relished by the official party, and the bill was accordingly rejected by *their* house—the Legislative Council. Now was exhibited the vindictive and malignant character of that house, and the mischievousness of clothing such a body with such enormous power. They henceforward rejected nearly every bill that was sent to them, including the Elementary School Bill, to which we have already alluded. On the rejection of the School Bill, Mr. Roebuck remarks:—

"The party of the Legislative Council are usually uncommonly pathetic in their lamentations over the ignorance of the Canadian population. The true worth of their hypocritical whining is here made manifest. They talk of ignorance and deprecate it, so long as such talk forwards or seems to forward their paltry purposes. They willingly do all they can to foster and continue ignorance, the moment that by so doing the same vile ends may be served."—*Existing Difficulties*, p. 39.

The last bill passed by the Assembly was for the purpose of embodying their demand for an elective council in a shape convenient for public discussion, and distinct and unequivocal reference. Moreover, it served to point out to ministers a convenient mode of settling the disputes without the necessity of imperial legislature, namely, by what is called in this country *a creation*. Lord Gosford might have been furnished with a sufficient number of blank *mandamuses* to enable him to call to the Council a sufficient number of men favourable to the elective principle, to carry the Assembly's bill. This done, the other reforms which the people desire, and for the sake of which, and for the perpetuation of good government, an Elective

Council is deemed necessary, might be carried through both houses without any disturbance of existing forms. Even the repeal of those Imperial Statutes, which have given so much disgust to the Canadians—the Tenures Act, and the British America Land Company's Act of Incorporation, might be effected by the only body really capable of adjusting the matter with the least possible disturbance of existing interests.

It has been objected, that a Provincial Legislature is incompetent to repeal or amend an Act of the Imperial Parliament. To this it may be answered, that what has once been done may be done again. The right of the Canadian Legislatures to amend an Imperial Act, has been acted upon, and formally recognized by the assent of the King. The present Assembly of Lower Canada sits and exercises its functions in virtue of a provincial act—a species of Canadian Reform Bill—amending, in an essential particular (namely, the division of the province, and distribution and number of representatives), the Canadian Constitutional Act itself. The other Acts proposed to be dealt with by the local legislature should never have been passed. In giving a constitution to each of the provinces, all further interference ought to have been abandoned. Wherever interference takes place, it is nearly certain that it will be at the instance of an intriguing minority; hence discontent must be the result. To permit the Canadian Assemblies, therefore, to repeal or amend all Imperial Statutes relating to the local affairs of the provinces, passed since the date of the Constitutional Act (1791) would merely be the undoing of evil. If any part of an Imperial Statute had worked well, we may be quite sure that it would be retained.

We now come to the last Act of the Assembly, namely, their Address to the King and the two Houses of Parliament, carried on the 26th of February, 1836, by a majority of fifty-five to seven. This Address contains a reiteration of their demands;—for

1. An Elective Council:
2. The Repeal of the obnoxious Acts already alluded to:
3. Complete control over Revenue and Expenditure:
4. Complete control over the Waste Lands.

But the feature most worthy of remark in this address, is the solemn declaration of the Assembly, that redress of the grievances must *precede* a vote of supplies.

“We wish for a government,” says the address, “which shall assure us freedom and security; the unrestricted effect of Your Majesty's declarations can alone confer it upon us; and it will be when we possess it, and can entertain a hope of the removal of the grievances and abuses

we complain of, that we can properly consider the means of giving effect to Your Majesty's wishes with regard to an appropriation of a permanent nature."—*Petition, Feb. 1836.*

We now draw towards the close of the history of the question within the Colony. Lord Glenelg once more refused the just demands of the Assembly: on the 22nd of September last, the Legislature was called together to enable the governor to communicate that refusal,—when the Assembly voted an address to his Excellency, repeating the decision they had come to at the previous Session, namely, that the redress of grievances must *precede* a vote of supplies. This address was carried through its various stages by varying majorities averaging fifty-six to seven; and the House was dismissed after a Session of less than three weeks. They have not been called together since.

Turn we now to the state of the question in the mother country.

Hither the discussion was shifted by the publication of the Reports of the Commissioners, which were delivered to members towards the latter end of February. To give any thing like an analysis of so voluminous a document, or rather set of documents, would be quite impossible with our limited space, even were it desirable; we shall therefore merely state, in general terms, that the Reports signed by all the Commissioners do two things,—*first*, they decide against all the demands of the Assembly, against the clearest evidence of their just nature, and even against their own admissions; and *second*, they take the trouble to propose schemes which have been repeatedly proposed to the Assembly and have been invariably rejected by that body—we allude especially to Lord Ripon's plan to obtain from the Assembly a permanent civil list, without conceding the condition demanded by the Assembly, namely, the perfect responsibility of the parties included in the list, with the exception of the governor. This plan having been rejected by the Assembly with something like indignation,—it is certainly rather absurd to incur the enormous expense of the Commission merely to reiterate that proposal. Let the reader examine the reports through and through, and he will find the general result correspond precisely with the above character.

But there is one of the Commissioners who goes a point further and recommends something new; but, as he could not get his colleagues to agree with him, he has been compelled to set his single name against his own absurd crotchets. This one is Sir Charles Edward Grey, whose proposals are in the ultra-dominant spirit of Orangeism, namely, the wholesale nullification of the Assembly; the rendering of the Executive, that is

the public servants, wholly independent and irresponsible; in short, the complete submission of the majority to the sway of the minority.

One of the plans for rendering the many subservient to the few—for overwhelming the influence of the people in the election of representatives, is to be found at page seventeen of the general Report. It is this: he proposes to allow each elector to have *one vote only*, although the number of representatives to be chosen might be two, three, four, or even five. The result of this would be, that the majority, anxious to secure the return of the best man, would probably vote for him alone; or, at all events, their votes would probably fall on two at the utmost. The minority would then step in, and with a few dozen votes, would return their member or members. In this way there would probably be a majority of the Assembly elected by a miserable minority of the people. It would have the same effect as the exclusion of Catholics from the House of Commons had on Ireland. It would effectually deliver the people to the oppression of a minority, always tyrannical and cruel in proportion to its insignificance in point of numbers.

Now there is something both cowardly and dishonest in all these proposals, which have for their object the indirect destruction of a body which it is dangerous to attack openly. The existence of a democratic Chamber is either good or bad. The Canadians having had near half a century's experience in its working, think it good. We think it good also,—but we certainly should not feel disposed to quarrel with any man for thinking it bad. What we object to is pretending to laud the institution, and yet seeking at the same time to destroy it. If Sir Charles Grey think a democratic branch a bad thing, let him say so at once, and openly and honestly propose its annihilation. After the avowal of such opinions, our readers will not be surprised to find that Sir Charles Grey—the government nominee in Canada—is an avowed Tory candidate in the approaching election.

We have alluded to the admissions of the Commissioners in favour of the case of the Assembly and people of Canada. They speak of the necessity of reform,—they even admit the propriety of making the Council elective at some future day,—they admit the defective character of the present Council, and that it has not performed the high duties entrusted to it with justice and impartiality, “but still they cannot advise the experiment (of the elective principle) now.” But the most important admission, and that which tells the most completely in favour of the views of the popular party, is where the Commissioners show that the

disputes have nothing to do with the question of origin, as had been often alleged, but have reference solely to "popular rights."

The general statement of the Canadian official party was, that the quarrel was one in which the French majority were arranged on one side, and the British population, unfortunately a minority, on the other—the former numbering, according to the statement of the official party, 450,000, and the latter 150,000. Now, it so happens that several of the "British" constituencies return members who agree with the views of the majority; and an accurate calculation of the respective numbers of the opposite parties of the Assembly and population represented, makes the minority to consist of only 9 or 10 members out of 90, and under 50,000 people out of the above 150,000, though the members of origin other than French (chiefly British) in the Assembly, number 24 or 25. Thus, if the question of elective institutions were decided by the votes of those of British origin alone, it would be carried in the affirmative.

This popular view of the character of the dispute, the Commissioners confirm:—

"In the course of these protracted disputes, too," say the commissioners, "the Assembly, composed almost wholly of French Canadians, have constantly figured as the assertors of popular rights, and as the advocates of liberal institutions; whilst the Council in which the English interest prevails have, on the other hand, been made to appear as the supporters of arbitrary power and of antiquated political doctrines; and to this alone we are persuaded the fact is to be attributed—that the majority of settlers from the United States have hitherto sided with the French rather than the English party. The representatives of the County of Stanstead and Missisquoi, have not been sent to Parliament to defend the feudal system, to protect the French language, or to oppose a system of registration—they have been sent to lend their aid to the assertors of popular rights, and to oppose a government by which, in their opinion, settlers from the United States have been neglected or regarded with disfavour."

And, in further condemnation of the Council, the Commissioners add:—

"Even during our own residence in the province, we have seen the Council continue to act in the same spirit, and discard what we believe would have proved a most salutary measure in a manner which can hardly be taken otherwise than to indicate at least a coldness towards the establishment of customs calculated to exercise the judgment, and promote the general improvement of the people: we allude to a Bill for enabling parishes and townships to elect local officers, and assess themselves for local purposes, which measure, though not absolutely rejected, was suffered to fail in a way that showed no friendliness to the principle."

We now come to the discussions in the House of Commons. On the 6th of March, Lord John Russell, taking the matter out of the hands of the Under-Secretary for the Colonies, Sir George Grey, who throughout appears to have taken no very prominent part in the proceedings, brought forward ten resolutions, the objects of which were to make declarations against the reforms which the Canadians demand, and to warrant the seizure of the Colonial revenues in violation of the Constitutional Act, and therewith to pay the public servants of the colony, and thereby render them wholly irresponsible. It would be idle to waste our time with a discussion about legal rights, when Lord John's resolutions are wholly a measure of *might*. We cannot, however, avoid expressing our surprise, that Englishmen did not take alarm at the eighth resolution, which warranted the seizure of the money, and the consequent nullification of the popular branch of the Legislature. That resolution appears to us to involve principles which, if extended to the mother country, would be wholly subversive of the constitution. We confess that it is a matter of surprise and regret, that of the liberal party only sixty members could be found to stand forth in defence—not simply of Canadian liberty—but of an important principle of universal application. The leading Irish members, we rejoice to add, nobly did their duty.

All that men could do in opposition to such an overwhelming force of numbers, was done by the small but energetic minority. No one can read the proceedings without perceiving how completely the talent, and especially reasoning, was on the side of the friends of good government. Considering the numbers, never perhaps was a question better fought in that House; and we have no hesitation in saying, that, as a political party, the Radicals acquired consistency and strength by the debate. After two nights' work in March, the debate was postponed, for the printing of the evidence delivered before a Committee of the House in 1834. This pushed the question past the Easter adjournment, and the debate was not again renewed till the 14th of April. On that night, Mr. Roebuck came down to the House with a proposal, which appears to us calculated to allay all discontent in the colony, by establishing such a system of government as would leave the Canadians nothing to desire, and to perpetuate the Colonial connexion by the generation of contentment and satisfaction in the colony. We shall now endeavour to explain this plan in an abridged form, suited rather to our limited space than to the subject itself, which certainly deserves to be treated at greater length. Mr. Roebuck's proposal comprised the following heads:—

1. To abolish the present Legislative Council, which had been condemned at all hands—by the colonists themselves, by the commissioners, by the speakers in debate, and by Lord John's own resolution.

2. To erect an Executive Council, removable by the Governor, of twelve persons, of whom the Attorney and Solicitor-General should be two.

The functions of this body we must describe in the language of Mr. Roebuck:—

“The functions of this council, as respects legislation, I can best describe by following a measure through its several stages. First, a bill is brought in and passed by the Assembly. It is then sent to the Governor in Council. It may then be amended or not. If not amended, it is then forwarded at once to the Governor for his assent or veto; but if amended it is sent back to the Assembly. They either adopt or reject the amendments; and in either case the bill is now to be sent at once to the Governor, and not to the Governor in Council. And on the Governor rests the ultimate responsibility of accepting or rejecting the measure. I must here guard myself against misconception. It must be carefully borne in mind, that no power of rejecting any measure is given to the Governor in Council. That body can only amend—it cannot reject. This is a matter of vital importance—so important that if such a Council should be created, and the power of rejection given to it—no satisfaction could be given to the people, who are now discontented: the grand object of my plan is to concentrate responsibility, and to bring it to bear upon known individuals. The Governor is he whom we seek to render circumspect and careful, and no subterfuge can be admitted by which this object can be protracted.”

To those who are acquainted with the character of Mr. Roebuck's highly cultivated mind—and what intelligent newspaper reader is not?—it is unnecessary to say that the honourable gentleman supported his plan by the most luminous and unanswerable reasoning. There is no point left untouched—no objection left unanswered—and the reader will rise from the perusal of the speech, impressed with a conviction, that, in neglecting the suggestion, ministers have lost an opportunity for the pacification of the Canadians, which may never again be offered to them.

Nothing, indeed, in the shape of an answer was attempted. Ministers seemed to admit that the plan was good. Even the ministerial organ—the *Morning Chronicle*—after condemning Mr. Roebuck's indiscretion (in what did not appear) winds up with a short paragraph, stating that the plan was unobjectionable. Why not adopt it then? Ah! why not, indeed? That is a question which would really puzzle a conjurer.

Another, and not an unimportant, part of Mr. Roebuck's plan, was an extension of that of Lord John Russell—we mean that in which a sort of congress of delegates is proposed to be assembled at Montreal. Lord John proposed a committee of the two legislatures of Upper and Lower Canada to meet at Montreal, to take cognizance of disputes between the two provinces. This would have been utterly useless, as the disputes in question (about the division of the revenue) never amounted to an inconvenient pitch, and were always satisfactorily settled by the commissioners named by both provinces. Mr. Roebuck's congress, however, would have been of a more useful character.

"I propose," said Mr. Roebuck in his speech of the 14th of April already quoted, "I propose that a general Assembly should sit, I care not where, but say at Montreal, composed of delegates chosen by the Assemblies of Upper and Lower Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Newfoundland, and Prince Edward's Island.* Each province should send five delegates, and the general Assembly should represent the various colonies thus electing them. The term for which the Assembly should exist should be four years. The most difficult matter connected with this body would be the describing, and accurately defining, its separate powers and duties.* Those ought to relate to two distinct subjects. 'This general Assembly ought to be both a judicial and a legislative body. The judicial functions ought to be two-fold—1st. It ought to constitute a tribunal before which the judges might be impeached, and out of the Assembly a court composed of not more than three members might be constituted. Secondly, a Court of Appeal, to perform all the judicial functions now exercised by our Privy Council. It would be difficult to describe accurately and clearly the precise extent of these judicial powers, and the manner in which they were to be exercised. A law of impeachment would be required, together with a code of procedure; but no difficulties of any moment will here obstruct the path of the legislature. If this tribunal were created for the trial of the delinquent judges, no difficulty would arise in granting them salaries for a term of years."

This would settle all the difficulties about the responsibility of the judges (now holding office during pleasure!), impeachments, and a permanent civil list. It would erect our colonial government on something like a solid and permanent basis; and yet the whole scheme, praised by nearly all parties, was rejected on a mere quibble. The opposition of both sides of the House resolved itself to this—"the Member of Bath has made what seems to be a wise proposal; but we do not know that the

* In the Free States of America, no difficulty arises from this source. The rule is, that powers not delegated to the Congress, or the general Government, are retained by the several sovereign states.

Assembly would acknowledge it; therefore, let us reject this measure of pacification, and pursue our own coercive measures." Accordingly, the House did the will of the ministry, and carried the fifth resolution.

On the 21st, Mr. Leader put the House into something very like a dilemma. In an excellent and argumentative speech, the Honourable Member said this:—"You say, my friend Mr. Roebuck's plan is good, but that you have no assurance that it will please the Assembly of Lower Canada. Well, then, wait six months, in order to ascertain their views." But this would not suit Lord John and his anti-Canadian supporters. Like Sterne and the poor mendicant Franciscan, they had *predetermined* the case. They accordingly rejected Mr. Leader's proposal, and that very night affirmed all the resolutions. And there the matter now rests (we write on the 22nd May) on this side of the Atlantic.

We must now carry our readers once more to Canada. The delay which has occurred in getting these coercive resolutions through the two Houses of Parliament, has enabled us to hear of their reception in Lower Canada. We have in our possession Montreal newspapers to the 24th of April, in which the debate of the 6th and 8th of March is published. These papers unfold a portion of the plan which the Canadians have at once determined to adopt, to meet, and, as far as lies in their power, to counteract, the coercive measures of the British Government. This plan is precisely what Mr. Roebuck predicted in his reply, on the 14th of April. It is similar to that which the old colonies adopted under similar circumstances; it is comprised in two words—*passive resistance*!

A letter has been published in the *True Sun* newspaper, explaining the course which the Canadians intend to pursue; and as that letter is from a source worthy of credit, we shall here transcribe it:

"Extract of a letter dated Montreal, April 23, 1837:—

"Lord John Russell's coercive resolutions have aroused universal indignation in this province, and the result is a very general determination to consume nothing which contributes to the revenues, which your infamous minister proposes to seize.

"For rum and brandy, which now contribute so largely to the revenue, we shall substitute whisky and beer. Tea we shall replace by coffee, made of barley, beans, and crust of bread, which our physicians declare to be more wholesome than tea, which our excellent wives now patriotically discover to be weakening to the nerves and to the stomach,

"The sugar of the maple will alone enter into the house of the

patriots; and Providence, as if intentionally, has this year sent us a most abundant crop.

"The tobacco of this province, and of Upper Canada, is fortunately of excellent quality; not a pound of that which has passed the custom-house will a single Canadian use.

"Our country traders (*Marchands*), have sworn the destruction of this same infamous custom-house, the fruitful source of our woes, and the succour of our persecutors. The smuggler—the hearty contemner of the line 45 degrees,* we shall henceforward regard as our saviour, and encourage by every means in our power. Recently we learn that there has been illicit importation of tea and tobacco, to a considerable extent, on the Chambly river—with this importation the duty-paid articles cannot compete, they will remain like drugs in the importers' stores. Instead of being regarded with an evil eye, the smuggler will now be regarded as the best friend to his country.

"Home-made cloths and other fabrics (*étouffe du pays*) of all kinds, will now be our only wear; to be seen in a coat of English cloth will be deemed disgraceful, and I am assured that throughout the country our patriotic women are busily employed manufacturing for our exigencies.

"We are determined to punish our enemies here, and their dupes on your side, at the sole points where they are vulnerable—the *purse*.

"In addition to this, there exists throughout the country a very powerful determination to refuse the notes of the Montreal and City Banks, and to encourage those of the People's bank, for the simple reason, that the two first are the strongholds of the party of our enemies. This is no idle threat, for on a former occasion an impression was made on the circulation of those banks to the extent of one-sixth in a few days: the hostility of the people to those banks will now be perpetual.

"We are quite sensible that this cannot be done without some suffering to ourselves; but we have calmly made the calculation, and we have determined to make the sacrifice, in order to paralyze our enemies. This course has already succeeded once in America, and it will succeed again. Farewell. When next I address you, I may perhaps have more extraordinary things to record. I send you herewith some papers: our small differences we have forgotten—the *Canadian* and the *Vindicator*—the Moderates and the Ultras, are at peace, working in amicable emulation against a common enemy. Again, farewell!"

Of the revenue of Lower Canada, a large portion is derived from the duty on spirits; 1s. per gallon is collected on about 1,000,000 gallons of rum, and 1s. 6d. per gallon on 250,000 gallons of gin and brandy. A substitution of whisky and beer for these, would nearly destroy the revenue from this fruitful source. The Tory party in Canada make it a distinct charge against the people of that colony, that they are servile in their

* The boundary line between Canada and the States.

obedience to their leaders; and as some partial experiments of the kind have succeeded, we cannot doubt but that "passive resistance" in Canada, will be still more successful than it was in the old colonies (now the United States) in 1776.

How long the Canadians will be content with a resistance merely passive, it would be rash to say. A popular commotion generally happens from some apparently trifling circumstance, acting upon a people predisposed to a rupture with their rulers. The accidental collection of a crowd in a particular spot; the thoughtless act of an idle boy; the throwing of a stone or the firing of a pop-gun, are any one of them sufficient, under certain circumstances, to cause the standard of revolt to be raised. The events that commonly happen at a Canadian city election would, we are quite convinced, raise the banner of independence, even without a massacre of the people, similar to that which took place on the 21st May 1832, called by the Canadians *le jour du sang*. Of this we feel quite certain, that the people are predisposed to receive any accidental impulse towards independence. Their position, too, is in every respect favourable to such a movement. They have no enemy on their frontier, as the United Colonies had; neither have they a foe in their very bosom, in the shape of an enslaved labouring population. The provocation they have just received, may be considered by the more ardent of the Canadians to justify the employment of force, to emancipate themselves from the thralldom of the Colonial office. What, then, is wanting to induce an attempt at independence? We fear but one thing—opportunity, a favourable opportunity; and that, as we have already said, the merest accident may afford.

On the receipt of the resolutions in Upper Canada, a meeting of the great Political Union of that province was convened, and a series of resolutions, five in number, were passed, condemning the course pursued by ministers, and expressive of sympathy with the Lower Province. The whole are too long for our space; but we cannot refrain from copying the two last, as evidence that the people of Upper Canada are not what the Tories would wish them.

"4. That we owe a deep and lasting debt of gratitude to Sir William Molesworth, Bart. Jos. Hume, J. A. Roebuck, Daniel O'Connell, J. T. Leader, Esqrs., and the other talented and uncompromising defenders of our rights and liberties in the British House of Commons, during the important debate on the affairs of the Canadas, on the 6th and 8th of March last."

"5. That this Union deeply sympathize, with the provinces of Lower

Canada and Nova Scotia in their present difficulties, and that they await with deep anxiety the action that may be had thereon, by those patriotic and long-suffering people."

We cannot close this article without stating, that the other British North American Colonies are also at issue with their respective local oligarchies. Nova Scotia has just passed a series of resolutions, the last of which is in favour of an elective council. Newfoundland, in its demands for reform, makes an elective council a *sine quâ non*. Prince Edward's Island has also pronounced herself in favour of the same wholesome measure. All these colonies have serious differences with the ruling power. In New Brunswick, we are not aware that the elective council question has been broached; but of this we are quite certain, that New Brunswick is highly discontented, and has lately succeeded in driving an obnoxious governor out of the colony.

Here, then, we have *a million and a half of people*, ripe for revolt—a number not very far short of the population of the old colonies, when "the troubles commenced," and yet our ministry, with Tory obstinacy, seems determined to bring about a similar result.

Separation is perhaps a contingency inseparable from colonies; but there is no reason why it should be violent. A wise minister would establish such a colonial government, as would insensibly lead to independence. For this sacred purpose what so obvious as institutions purely elective? Not that independence would so soon occur, as in consequence of a system of coercion. The duration of the colonial connexion will be in the inverse ratio of imperial interference, and it might be almost perpetual, by leaving the colonists entirely to themselves.

We now close this somewhat long article, by declaring our solemn opinion, that unless ministers entirely abandon their system of colonial policy, they will one day be surprised by the apparition of LE JEUNE CANADA.*

ART. V.—*Londres: Voyage contenant la Description de cette Capitale, avec les Mœurs, &c. &c.*, par Albert Montémont. Paris.

THE remarks of foreigners on our institutions are often more instructive than the opinions of native critics: habit renders the latter less liable to observe general defects, while the

* See Postscript at the end of this Number.

unvitiated eye of the former immediately detects a fault. The generality of tourists are so superficial in their knowledge of the countries they describe, that we cannot rely implicitly either on the accuracy of their statements or the infallibility of their judgment; but when there are points on which they are all agreed, it must be confessed that the concurrence of opinion adds considerably to its force. If, moreover, to the written observations of individual travellers, is added the verbal testimony of foreigners in general, we must allow that there is some foundation for their remarks, whether they contain praise or blame; and as the former is frequently bestowed, we ought not to complain when the latter is occasionally applied. Strangers do not deny the wealth of England, the importance of her colonial possessions, the extent of her trade, the industry of her manufactories, and the general activity of all her people: these are sources of greatness which are averred, proved, and uncontested; but there are other claims to rank as the first of civilized nations, which, though boldly put forth by patriotic eulogists at home, are not readily admitted by unprejudiced observers abroad.

In the work before us we find the following rather extraordinary sentence:—Speaking of London, the writer describes the buildings as a “mensonge d'architecture, comme la constitution est un mensonge de liberté, la religion une simagrée de piété, et les mœurs un mensonge de prudence.”

On the architecture of a town depends the first impression a stranger receives on his arrival; and to the inferiority of London in this respect we attribute the disappointment of our traveller. The foreigner who has passed by the Arc de l'Etoile smiles at the arch at Hyde Park Corner; accustomed to the Tuilleries, he is astonished on his first visit to Buckingham Palace; and when asking for the Louvre of London, can scarcely believe the cicerone who conducts him to the National Gallery. It is the size, not the beauty, of London, which strikes the foreigner; he admires the width of the streets, but looks with contempt on the houses which compose them—small black buildings, as our author describes them, “made of wood and brick, without height or beauty—temporary abodes, which, like tents, are destined to endure no longer than the lease on which they are built.” Paint and plaster have done their best to conceal the poverty of the materials, but neither paint nor plaster can correct the proportions, or give elevation to the structure. With the exception of Apsley and Burlington; Northumberland and Lansdowne houses, the stranger looks in vain for the nobleman's palace, or wealthy commoner's hotel. Two-story houses, with small windows and narrow doorways, are the town-residences of

the rich and haughty aristocracy of England. The public buildings are scarcely more remarkable for their elegance than the private houses. Their number is very small considering the size of London; and the close neighbourhood of other buildings prevents the little merit they have from being sufficiently remarked. The bridges alone stand pre-eminent in the world for beauty and solidity. The broad Thames is shut out from the view, and the irregular wharfs and warehouses on its banks evince neither taste nor plan in their erection. The public offices are not distinguished for their splendour, and when we compare the Admiralty in London with the Admiralty in Petersburg, or the treasury of the former city with the new Hotel erecting on the Quai d'Orsay at Paris, we must confess that the government houses in Whitehall and Downing-street are not in proportion with the importance of the business which is transacted in them. The late houses of Parliament caused respect in the English antiquarian, but only disappointment to the foreign traveller. The Royal residences are pitiful, and, with the exception of Somerset House, not a building in London deserves the title of Palace. Some authors attribute the deficiency in regal grandeur to the limited nature of the monarchy, and others trace the unclassic character of the public buildings to the commercial disposition of the people. Neither is the real case, for millions have been voted for royal palaces, and the abortive attempts at architectural ornament prove that not the wish but the genius is wanting. Venice and Genoa are cities of palaces, but both Venice and Genoa were raised by a mercantile and commercial people. A third and still more ridiculous excuse has been grounded on the cold and ungenial nature of our northern latitude. This plea may be justly urged as far as statuary is concerned, for the delicate work of the chisel, and the material it requires, may be unable to resist the corrosive damps of our variable and humid climate; but neither the coldness of the climate, nor the commercial spirit of the nation, can be admitted as excuses for the bad taste of our buildings. The East India Company of merchants have raised in Calcutta, perhaps, the noblest building in the British dominions; and there is no reason why the banks of the Thames should not be lined with palaces, as well as the still colder shores of the Neva. Other causes than these must exist; and, perhaps, we shall be nearer the truth if we attribute the mean appearance of our town houses to the general prevalence of isolated domicile. The English system of one family occupying an entire house may possibly have encreased the cleanliness, but certainly has destroyed the grandeur of our domestic buildings. The number of houses in the

chief towns, and the number of families who inhabit them, are given in returns made to Parliament, pursuant to an Act for taking an account of the British population. According to these tables, there are in London 171 families to a hundred houses; in Liverpool, 181; Manchester, 116; and Birmingham, 105; whereas in Paris there are at least five hundred families to a hundred houses. According to another statement, there are ten persons to one house in London, twenty to one in Paris, and more than forty-seven to one in Petersburg.* The consequence of this difference is evident: the size of the habitation is in proportion to the number of individuals who occupy it; and the houses in Paris are superior to the houses in London, inasmuch as the expenses and incomes of twenty persons are greater than the expenses and incomes of ten. Want of space, and density of population, cannot be urged as objections to the adoption of the Continental system, for supposing one Paris house to occupy the same ground as three London houses, the three London houses would be tenanted by three families, while the one Paris house, being three stories high, would be occupied by the same number of families. The advantages, as far as regards architectural grandeur, are too evident to need further comment; but there is another consideration which ought to be duly weighed before we give either system the preference—which of the two customs contributes most to the health and convenience of the inhabitants. The above-mentioned returns state the proportion of deaths to the population; and, though the results are not uniform, a general inference has been drawn, that mortality decreases in proportion to the increasing isolation of domicile. This conclusion is perfectly just, as far as regards England; but in France, and other continental countries, where a different system exists, and several families inhabit the same house, the average of mortality is no higher than in the most favoured towns of England. The disparity of the buildings in England and the Continent reconciles the apparent inconsistency of the different results; and if, instead of the half-ventilated cottages which compose our streets, the lofty buildings of Paris or Genoa, Florence or Petersburg, were substituted, many families might lodge beneath the same roof without detriment to their health, or inconvenience to one another.

Another cause of the superiority of Paris to London in

	Inhabitants.	Houses.
* London - - -	1,800,000	180,000
• Paris - - -	900,000	45,000
Petersburg - - -	450,000	9,000

—*Albert Montémont.*

architectural beauty, may exist in the discretionary powers of the Directeur-Général de Ponts et Chaussées, and the obligatory inspection of the Grande Voirie. Government in France has the sole direction of various works, which in England are left to the judgment of independent companies. The Minister of the Interior, and under him, the Corps Royal de Ponts et Chaussées, are intrusted with the design and execution of every public building; a power and responsibility greater than those possessed or required from the Commissioners of Woods and Forests. Temporary buildings answer the purposes of individual speculators, and the rapidity with which they are raised in England has caused the French tourist to remark that the English know how to build towns but not houses.

After the architectural appearance of a town, the next subject which attracts the attention of a stranger is the character of the public amusements of the people. The traveller, if a Frenchman, must find in this respect a melancholy contrast between the British metropolis and his own gay and amusing capital. Instead of the well-regulated theatres and innumerable concerts which occupy the leisure hours and refine the habits of the Parisians, he observes in London puritanical affectation, or the most unsophisticated depravity. The dead and cheerless Sunday, the absence of song and dance, the suspension of all innocent amusements, make him regret the moody and unsocial character of the English, or, like the author before us, consider their religion *une simagrée de piété*, and their customs *un mensonge de prudence*.*

The heavenly dispensation which makes light the burden of the oppressed, and cheers up the gloomy abode of misery, is in direct opposition to the spirit which dictated the Sabbath Bill, and attempted to deprive poverty of its only consolation. Heaven designed the seventh day as a day of rest, and not of privation—a day of prayer and rejoicing, not of gloomy meditation and unsocial seclusion. Fanatics, however, are found in the senate of the nation, who have attempted to pervert the generous commandment of God into a mandate of austerity. Their misguided zeal would fill to the very brim the bitter cup which misery holds to the lips of its victims. Let us reflect for a moment on the results which would accrue from the pharisaical observance of the Jewish Sabbath, and, if our religion is not shocked, our humanity at least will be moved.

For six days the poor man toils; his body is bent with labour, and his mind exhausted by constant application. The seventh

* The statute-book has been disgraced, since the reign of George the Second, with restrictions on the most innocent and least expensive amusements of the people.

day comes, but its coming only excludes him from his gloomy workshop to confine him in his still more gloomy habitation. Relaxation is denied him, amusement forbidden him. He may not leave the unwholesome atmosphere of a narrow street and seek the open fields. Public places are shut and public conveyances stopped on that day. To such a wretch so disheartened in spirit, so debilitated in frame, what relaxation can the Sabbath of these would-be ascetics bring?

This is the bright side of the picture; the reverse, unfortunately, presents the more general portraits. Many men are deprived of the comfort of a home, and how are they to occupy the time left weekly vacant on their hands? "With few exceptions," Dr. Kay remarks, "they spend Sunday in supine sloth and listless inactivity." Without incentives, they will not seek healthful recreation, and folly alone can expect them to spend the whole of the day in solemn meditation. Adam Smith has justly remarked that "nature requires to be relieved by some indulgence, sometimes of ease only, but sometimes too of dissipation and diversion. If this call is not complied with, the consequences are dangerous, and often fatal, and such as always bring on the peculiar infirmity of the trade." Spite of this warning, the Sabbath legislators wish to encrease the already gloomy character of the English Sunday. With other ministrations charitable religion heals her erring and distempered children. Not in solitude and gloomy meditation, but amid the joyous scenes and sunny hues of life, the angry spirit is healed and harmonized. "There," continues the poet, whose words we borrow,

" — man relents, and can no more endure
To be a jarring and dissonant thing
Amid the general dance and minstrelsy."

Opinion is tyrannical in England, and individual liberty suffers more from it than from the legislative enactments of arbitrary governments. Notwithstanding their cry for religious liberty, the Evangelical dissenters possess the spirit of toleration in a less degree than the zealots of any other country in Europe. In France, Germany, and Russia, no attempt has been made to force on the country particular religious observances; and even in Austria and Italy the secular government leaves the ordination of fasts and ceremonies to the exhortations of the spiritual advisers of the people; but in England, each sect, while it talks aloud of independence, tries to force its own peculiar practices on the rest of society, and designates any deviation from its individual idea of propriety as infidelity or immorality. Many a puritan who speaks of liberty of conscience would fine or imprison those who do

not conform to his notion of Sabbath-observances; whereas, if he will attentively study the New Testament, he will find that those who differ from him differ not only conscientiously, but on the very highest authority.

Notwithstanding this outward sanctity of manner, the author, whose name we have placed at the head of this article, does not concede to the English a higher state of morality than is generally supposed to exist in Paris. In some instances even he claims, like many other foreigners, a superior delicacy of manners, and a greater respect to decorum for his own country and its continental neighbours.* The highest and lowest classes are nearly the same in every large city of Europe, and the picture our author draws of society in the fashionable circles of London differs little from that which a stranger would naturally draw of society in the Faubourg St. Honoré. It is in the middle class that the difference between the two countries is most conspicuous, and while we award to our countrymen superior energy and industry, we must concede to France the merit of greater taste and refinement. London is, by preeminence in trade, the mart of the world, and its companies of merchants the most wealthy and enterprising societies existing, but unlike their prototypes of Venice and Genoa, they have not combined a taste for the fine arts with the more substantial acquisitions of wealth. Until lately their attention never soared above the study of an invoice, and the important items of the ledger, while the patronage of art and elegance was left as a monopoly to the aristocratic and less active part of the community. In France, on the contrary, as was justly observed in the House of Commons, there exists an atmosphere of art. Schools of design are opened in all large towns, and the advantage to the manufactures is evident in the superiority of taste in their patterns. In architecture, in dress, in the furniture of a room, or the decorations of a theatre, the French display a more refined and classical taste than the English, and this difference can only proceed from the circumstance of art being popular in France, and only aristocratic in England. Classic taste is acquired by a constant observance of perfect models, and repeated attempts to imitate; for unless the eye becomes habituated to the proportions of beauty, and the mind formed by the study of masters, natural genius will run into excesses, and often mistake a departure from necessary rules as a proof of originality. The opportunities of contemplating works of art are so sparingly afforded in England compared with the Continent, that we naturally expect the public taste to be considerably in the rearward of our less wealthy neighbours. Sunday, which weekly sees thousands of

working-people fixing their eager eyes on the paintings of the Louvre and the wonders of the Vatican, closes the doors of the British Museum and the London National Gallery. Most of the religions which exist in England are hostile to the fine arts. The Quakers and other dissenters affect simplicity if not deformity in their places of worship, while the Established Church itself reluctantly admits either painting or sculpture within its walls. Puritanism boasts of never having witnessed a play of Shakespeare, and prudery ostentatiously pulls down her veil as she passes an uncovered statue by Canova. These feelings do not exist on the Continent, and yet we will fearlessly assert that true decency is as much respected, and real virtue as much practised, in Petersburg, Berlin, or Rome, as in London or the Scottish capital of Sabbath-observers. We do not question the sincerity of those who differ from us in their ideas of morality and religion; but we must acquit the French tourist of having made an unfounded assertion when he describes religion in England as *une simagrée de piété, et les mœurs un mensonge de pruderie*. The expression is too general, but it is not altogether without just grounds.

Disappointed in the architectural appearance of London, and disgusted with the Puritanism of its customs, the traveller turns his attention to its industry and commerce, as the more pleasing as well as more striking characteristics of the nation. *There*, every thing not only meets but surpasses his expectation. *There* he discovers the source of England's political importance, and the charm which enables her arm to wield the sceptre over more than a hundred million subjects. Commercial importance is the forerunner of preeminence in the arts, and the activity displayed in accumulating wealth, gives promise of a corresponding taste in the employment of it. England is the least stationary country in Europe; improvement succeeds improvement, and the eagerness with which new inventions are adopted affords an instant opportunity of trying their worth. Civilization is on the advance in every part of the world, but in England its rapid progress comes more immediately under the eye of the observer.

Steam changes the whole system of communication, and gas gives to the night all the convenience of day. Railroads start into existence and bring cities which are geographically distant into virtual vicinity. The very operations of the understanding come within the powers of mechanism, and Babbage's machine supersedes, in accuracy of calculation, the most mathematical mind. Ingenuity invents and industry perfects engines capable of altering the whole system of society. Machinery carries its influence into the moral state of the community, and in pro-

portion as the labour of the hand is decreased the action of the mind is accelerated. A craving after knowledge has become general, but the thirst is of that feverish nature that it denotes an unhealthy excitement. The first dawn of knowledge on a class who have hitherto been uneducated, dazzles like the light upon eyes which have been couched for cataract. A *little* learning amongst the lower orders has not produced all the good effects which were expected from it; but increased information amongst the higher has greatly improved the state of society. With them old prejudices are shaken, and the taste of the age leaves the coarse diet of ruder days to pant after the purer waters of modern refinement. Elegance in the arts, delicacy in manners, and luxury in the mode of living, keep pace with the improvements of mechanics and the discoveries of chemists. Literary fame has become the object of aristocratic ambition, and many a high-born author follows a pursuit which he would formerly have deemed below his notice. Unions and clubs, societies and companies, have multiplied over the land; an impatient public demand reforms, and half-educated masses perform their political evolutions with all the precision of Machiavelian tactics.

These things are passing with such startling rapidity that the man of retirement is roused from his indifference, and forced to take interest in the bustling world. The character of the age appears in such palpable forms that the dullest sight can distinguish its features. The indolent can no longer repose in the conviction that years of idleness may roll by, and their social position remain unaltered, for the world is changing around them, and their relative situation must change with it. No wonder then that some of those whom the varying scene has disturbed in their monotonous retreat should be alarmed at the sudden change, and ask aloud for a moment's pause. No wonder that a considerable party should endeavour to obstruct the way, and with their extreme caution temper the impetuosity of others. As long as timidity exists in human nature there will be a reluctance to experiment, and the party feeling this reluctance will act as a retarding power. Their influence, however, is counterbalanced by the impetus given to society, and in attempting to arrest the spirit of improvement they have been unconsciously borne away with it. We speak not of the determined party who have in either house opposed every motion of reform; but we allude to that numerous body who prefer "to bear the ills they have, than fly to others that they know not of"—men who, if they possess some little good, would not risk that little on the chance of obtaining more:—easy dispositions, who consider indolence as the greatest blessing; or, it may be, morbid minds,

though dissatisfied with the present, are still more diffident of the future. But their opposition is useless, for social changes, when once put in motion, quickly gain accelerated speed, while they who refuse to assist in propelling the machine are unconsciously propelled by it. The mass of mankind welcome mutations, for wretchedness expects a relief in the change, and imagination still pictures to itself some thing brighter in the future.

This rapid but effective progress strikes the foreigner at every step he takes on British soil. He sees things propelled by an invisible force, and spite of every obstacle bear due on their course. He sees distances reduced, communication kept up with the entire world, population increasing, and new nations starting into existence both in the east and western hemisphere. Continents, hitherto desert, have had their shores invaded, and their once impenetrable forests peopled with a civilized and industrious race. The silence which reigned in them for "the profound six thousand years" has been broken by the sound of English accents and the tread of English planters. There is not a sea nor a river which is not ploughed by English keels, not a continent or an island which does not hold communication with English merchants. "Every flow and ebb of the tide," our author says, "brings to London or carries to the ocean nearly eight thousand tons of merchandise."

It is not the grandeur of her capital, nor the general affluence of its population, which draws from a foreigner an acknowledgment of the greatness and influence of England: it is as the centre of a vast empire—as the parent stock of rising nations—as the heart of a power, whose extremities touch the Arctic and the Antarctic—a power who counts her hundreds of millions of subjects, speaking a hundred different languages, and following as many different creeds—it is as the central government of this enormous, but heterogeneous empire, that the foreigner considers London the first and most important city in the world.

Paris is justly called the Capital of the Arts, the great seat of literature—a city of architectural beauty, and an umpire in matters of taste; but its splendid quays and royal palaces have not the air of universal sway which characterizes the port of London, nor do they, like that emporium of the world, carry the imagination beyond the circuit of their walls: whereas, the stranger who visits the docks of London is forced to contemplate every region of the globe, from the vast empire of China and the Indian Peninsula, to the boundless tracks of North America, and the innumerable islands of the Polynesian Ocean. In Asia, Africa, and America, England possesses large

territories: to all she has carried her industry and commerce, and in all of them large communities of settlers are rapidly rising. Every year sees thousands leave the mud cabin and the unwholesome workhouse, for the salubrious banks of the St. Lawrence and the fertile shores of Lake Huron. In Van Dieman's Land, and on the shores of Australia, the nucleus of a powerful people has been formed. This unlimited increase of numbers strikes the foreigner as the great feature in the future prospects of England; nor is the propagation of the English language a matter of slight importance. By the dissemination of her language, France gained a moral influence in Europe, which added to her supremacy more than the triumphs of her arms. It gave her the advantage in all diplomatic relations, and extended the patronage of her literature to the frontiers of Asia. The English language, however, promises to extend itself to far wider limits. In Australia, Southern Africa, and British America, millions speak it as their vernacular tongue: it has penetrated into Hindostan, and is known to the South-Sea Islanders; it is carried to the extreme West by the tide of emigration, whose yearly flow gains nearer and nearer to the Pacific. Add to all this, the increase of that people, who, though born of British parents, were rudely weaned from the maternal country.

The Anglo-Indian Empire, both in respect to its origin and present government, stands alone and unprecedented in the annals of the world. The rule of Napoleon, when his power extended from Lisbon to Vienna, and from Naples to Amsterdam, was but a shadow of the Company's influence, which reaches from Ceylon to the Himalaya Mountains—from the territories of Runjeet Sing to the frontiers of China. The statistics of Hindostan, and the number of descriptions recently published of that country, as well as the real or supposed designs of Russia, have drawn the attention of foreigners to our Oriental possessions, and caused the knowledge of them to be more generally diffused than at any former period of their history. It is needless to state the impression which the study of that empire leaves upon the mind—an empire, to which the Cape and Mauritius are the outposts—Ascension and St. Helen's, pickets stationed on the way.

In the foregoing remarks, we have enlarged only on the first impressions our author received on arriving in London—impressions which induce him to describe the buildings as a "*mensonge d'architecture, comme la religion est une simagrée de piété et les mœurs un 'mensonge de pruderie,'*" but which

force him to acknowledge that London still remains the "souveraine des intérêts ou la bourse du monde."

To the above censure on the puritanism of our religion and the prudery of our manners, he adds, with equal boldness and less judgment, that our political institutions are a "mensonge de liberté."* The limits of this article do not allow us to pursue the subject at great length, but we cannot refrain from examining some of the causes which disqualify the author from being a competent judge, and tend to bias his hastily-formed opinion on the subject.

No two countries differ more essentially from each other than England and France: the difference does not consist more in the nature of their institutions than in their notions of abstract principles. The word liberty has a different signification amongst our neighbours, to what we understand by it at home, and the nearest definition which can be given of the different meanings, is by explaining it as equality in one country, and free agency in the other. A Frenchman cannot tolerate the precedence we give to rank, while an Englishman does not feel his personal freedom offended by the courtesy usually paid to the order of nobility. That an Englishman's house is his castle, is a common boast in this land, whereas, in Paris, a thousand domiciliary visits, and three times that number of arrests on suspicion, might take place in the year, without a riot being caused or a single petition being presented to Parliament. The nation has been so long habituated to military rule, that Paris resembles a garrison town in the time of war, rather than a civil capital during profound peace. *Here* a street is closed—*there* the passers-by are not allowed to walk on the pavement; sentinels meet you at every step, and your carriage is stopped at the barrier while your name and intended residence are registered at the police-office. The system of passports is as injurious to individual liberty, as it is ineffectual in preventing crime. Don Carlos and his agents have traversed and retraversed the country without being detected, while offenders who have escaped from prison have, in many cases, crossed the frontier without exposing themselves to the slightest suspicion. The patronage it places in the hands of government, and the dependence of that government for support solely on the number of its *employés*, are probably the only motives for continuing a system which has

* The late Ottoman Minister to the Court of St. James's, observed, that in consequence of the multiplicity of conventional laws, and the hundred forms necessary to be observed in England, there was more personal freedom in the Sultan's dominions than in those of his Britannic Majesty.

notoriously failed to effect its original purpose, and merely tends to harass innocent and inoffensive persons.

Centralization gives so peculiar a character to the institutions of France, that it is difficult to compare them with the corresponding establishments of England; and a foreigner who has been accustomed to the uniformity of the former system, is naturally puzzled by the irregularity unavoidable in the latter. Government undertakes, in France, that which is here abandoned to private companies; and many public works which are conducted solely by the home department on the continent, are in England left to the discretion of a hundred different trusts. Various laws and by-laws, which are necessary to protect these private companies, and encourage the monied contractors, are dispensed with abroad, in consequence of the uniform system of centralization. Roads, canals, markets, and theatres, as well as posting, draining, &c. &c. are in the hands of chartered companies or licensed individuals, and could not be carried on with either profit or efficiency, unless certain privileges as well as restrictions were imposed on the speculators. These are the apparent incongruities which strike the foreigner, and are often erroneously set down as an uncalled-for interference on the part of subalterns. The system of self-government, and the numerous situations independent of the ministry, dress so many persons in a little brief authority, that we cannot be surprised if several meddling Dogberries should be found among the number. The love of legislation is inherent in the human breast; and when narrow minds have an opportunity of indulging it, they carry their interference beyond the range of legitimate influence. Attempts to dictate for the private conduct of individuals, and check the innocent amusements of the people, unfortunately occur too often, but they are the excrescences rather than the spirit of the system. The principle of self-government, which invests so many obscure individuals with authority, makes them also watch with a jealous eye each other's motions. The slightest injury to their particular interest calls forth a murmur; from one end of England to the other the cry of misery is often heard: the agricultural—the manufacturing—the shipping interest—each and all have their wrongs. In parliament—in public prints—in provincial meetings, the same tone prevails; but the foreigner who should judge by what he hears, and not by what he sees, would form a very erroneous opinion of society.

It is not only not probable, but not possible, that the people should be content; but we must not infer neediness of condition from restlessness of character, nor ought we to estimate misery according to the loudness of complaint. Silence does

not necessarily argue content, and the worst part of the worst bondage is to bear without complaint. Where the high alone have the liberty to speak, the voice of the nation must be tuned to pleasure, for the privileged class have attained the utmost round, and their sole desire is to keep the ladder steady beneath them. *They* are satisfied with things as they are, and find in their situation no cause of complaint. But where the middle and lower classes have the means of expressing their feelings, the hankering after something better gives a tone of discontent to their words. The tone grows louder and more distinct in proportion to the rapidity with which society progresses; for those who have risen a little, are the most anxious to rise more, because success encourages the spirit, and advancement naturally increases the desire of promotion. In England popular assemblies ring, and the public press teems with complaints; but the demonstration of feeling indicates the extravagant expectations, rather than the actual misery of the complainants. An economical people do not meet to felicitate each other on what they have gained, but to plan the means of gaining more—to state their grievances, not enumerate their comforts. The very restlessness of their conduct shows that they are in a progressive state, for a nation bustles into prosperity, but sinks quietly into decay.

Unless the subject is foreign aggression, or some organic change in the constitution, the great mass of the French population take little interest in parliamentary proceedings. They do not, as in England, enter into the details of municipal corporations, fight step by step the question of church-rates, or read whole volumes of evidence on the poor-laws: their attention is devoted to general principles; and, instead of studying the thousand modifications of a mixed government, they attend only to the grand features of monarchy on the one hand, and republicanism on the other. The leading articles in their journals, which are generally written with eloquence, resemble essays on legislation, rather than the minute enquiry into every step the government takes, which characterizes our diurnal press. Their newspapers, however, have a greater influence on public opinion than is ever obtained by the best written journals in England; because, in France, they are the sole channel of information and only organ of the people, whereas the public meetings and public dinners, the long speeches and warm debates, which take place in every county and every town in the United Kingdom, give full scope and submit to severe scrutiny the various sentiments of every political sect. By not only hearing subjects of domestic policy discussed, but even taking a part in the discussion, a

great portion of the population become so interested in the movements of the legislature, as to consider themselves individually concerned. They debate on the same questions, and with the same forms and ceremonies as are entertained and observed within the walls of parliament. Although these meetings and associations have occasionally their inconvenience, they accustom their members to the details of business, and acquaint the people with the slow progress of a deliberative assembly. Another, and a still more important object is attained, by showing the great variety of opinions which exist in society, and habituating parties to have their most favourite theories denied; for they are prepared, in consequence, to submit to a tedious opposition, and look upon the divisions within the precincts of parliament as a fair epitome of the great struggle which is taking place out of doors.

In France the government and the nation are seldom identified: in the ideas of the people they are ever at variance,—and the spirit of the one is supposed to retrograde towards absolutism in proportion as the other tends towards liberality. In consequence of the qualification being too dear for the poverty of the people, and the system of subdivision of property tending to reduce still lower the average wealth of the land-owners, the number of electors must annually decrease, and the Chamber represent in proportion a still smaller fraction of the nation. Even in this small number of electors, many neglect to exercise their rights, and a general indifference as to elections pervades the entire body. Instead of making the hustings the grand scene of political struggles, and looking for the advantages of victory in the subsequent divisions of the Chamber, the French seldom use constitutional means to achieve their purposes, but rely on the influence of secret societies and the actual violence of a mob. The cause of this system of illegal agitation may be traced to the circumstance of so considerable a portion of the Parisian population having no connexion directly or indirectly with the legislative or electoral body; and another motive may also be discovered in the absence of an aristocracy, who by their wealth and independence, can effectually struggle against the influential patronage of government. When we consider that the number of places at the disposal of the French government is greater than the number of electors, we can scarcely be surprised if the opposition party should seek to remove the struggle from the field of parliament to the more advantageous position of the clubs and streets of Paris. The democratic measure of subdividing landed property required an equally democratic extension of the suffrage; and until the legislature corresponds in its

organization with the other institutions of the country, the great mass of the people can never consider themselves identified with the government. They look upon it as a stranger placed amongst them only to coerce, and with which they are by necessity at variance. The nation is divided into two classes—the people and the crown: and as the former must from its nature be divided into conflicting elements, so the latter from the same cause must be united in all its parts. There is no landed aristocracy to watch with a jealous eye its influence, or to serve as a rallying point to the rest of the community; but the people, and the people alone, have to struggle, unaided and unabettèd, against the concentrated power and undue patronage of the crown. As numerical strength is the only weapon the people possess, and that weapon is rendered useless in consequence of the small number of electors, the people are generally worsted in their political struggles; and, when this is the case, there is no intermediate body to check the victor, but the crown uses, at its own will and discretion, the advantages and spoil of the victory. This is fully illustrated by the present composition of the Chamber, wherein there are nearly as many Deputies under the immediate influence of government as independent of it. The consequence is, that popular movements are directed against the constitution itself; and the blow is struck not at the abuses of government, but at its very existence. The last five years have presented a succession of illegal associations, popular insurrections, and attempts at assassination on the part of the unrepresented people; and of distrust, coercion, and secret *espionage*, on the side of the crown. The fact is, that a monarchy and aristocratic legislature, surrounded by republican institutions and democratic principles, is an anomaly which does not seem capable of being reduced to practice. The elective system adopted in the National Guards is perfectly inconsistent with the elective system as regards the Chamber of Deputies, for the one is democratic, and the other exclusive in the extreme. This discrepancy has already shown its evil effects in the provinces; and if the National Guards in the south-east had not been disbanded, an armed democracy would have been organized in direct opposition to the legislative body. As it is, not only the actual government but the constitution itself depends for existence on the loyalty of the National Guards of Paris,—who, since the reduction of the great landed proprietors in the country, constitute a comparative aristocracy in France. In order to preserve uniformity in their political institutions, universal suffrage ought to have accompanied a change in the law of primogeniture; for notwithstanding the various reductions in

the qualification of voters, the Chamber of Deputies represents a very small fraction of the educated population. One democratic measure necessarily entails another, and whatever checks government may apply to the machine, the tendency of society is essentially towards republicanism. The Municipal Government affords another example of the incongruity which accrues from not modelling on the same plan the various institutions of the country. The rural districts, in consequence of the division of property, have lost their wealthiest and most intelligent population,—while the towns, in consequence of the graduated scale of qualification, possess an inadequate number of voters. Centralization, however, cripples the powers of the Municipal Councils; and notwithstanding several propositions to the contrary, all the great public works are under the immediate direction of the Minister of the Interior. Detrimental as such a system would be in its full application to England, it is doubtful if any other plan could be safely adopted in France, for *there* the people are individually poor while the government is essentially rich. The rural communes have neither the same wants nor the same enterprise as the country districts in England; they neither require luxuries at a short notice from the capital, nor a quick conveyance for their own persons to it. In some instances the mayor and town-councillors care little about roads, and more than one commune has questioned the utility of any roads at all.

The reverse of all this is the case in England: here the political institutions are liberal, while the social are essentially aristocratic. Loyalty is the boast of a British subject,—and though the melioration of the Constitution is the constant theme of debate, its destruction has never yet been the object of any party. A struggle is continually going on in Parliament,—and the struggle is of that animated character, that it rivets the attention of the nation. The people look with anxiety to the final result; but the forms are so numerous and the measures so deliberate, that the winning side can only advance step by step, and never take, as in France, the country by surprise.

The institutions of Great Britain are remarkable for their pliability, or rather the facility with which they adopt the modifications required by time. They renovate themselves without violence or detriment, and the most essential part of the Constitution is the capacity of remodelling itself. This quality serves as a bulwark against external violence, and confines popular excitement to petitioning Parliament.

In France, on the contrary, every thing is done by a *coup d'état*, or on the spur of the moment. The ordinances of Poli-

gnac overthrew the dynasty : the attempt of Fieschi introduced the laws of coercion, and the insurrection of Strasbourg nearly destroyed trial by jury. The struggle between the different parties in the state resembles a war between hostile nations rather than the rivalry which ought to exist between the various sections of a popular government. Success depends upon the energy of the executive or the patronage of the crown, rather than on the popularity of a ministry or the justice of its measures. Strength, and not argument, is the arm invariably employed ; and this unconstitutional character of the government has given rise to the opinion that France is only fit to be ruled by a military despotism. Towards a military despotism, however, it is verging with painful rapidity. The National Guards have obtained at Paris a power almost equal to that formerly held by the Janissaries in Constantinople. The crown preserves its extensive patronage, and the government refuses to discontinue its useless establishments,—while the voluntary banishment with which the beaten party show their opposition to existing things, removes the difficulties which would otherwise obstruct the further progress of the victors. If the doctrinaires seize the helm, the legitimists desert the ship ; and if the republicans were to get possession of the quarter-deck, the doctrinaires would take to the boats, and leave the vessel of the state to ride out the storm as she could. In England, on the contrary, statesmen never forsake the ship : when superseded in command, they take their stand before the mast, and though they disapprove of the course she lays, they try to steer her in that course with safety. If they cannot arrest a measure, they are content to modify it, and never like the French nobles expatriate themselves in despair.

The elements of society are still disorganized,—and we believe that few persons are bold enough to deny that during the last five years France has retrograded in social happiness. Equality is the object of the French reformers ; and, unfortunately, equality can be produced by debasing the higher classes as well as by raising the lower. The *bourgeoisie* show their enmity not only to the substantial privileges, but even to the idle trappings of nobility : they cut down hereditary titles, erase armorial bearings, and wage war against the etiquette of a court, while the populace in their turn cry out against the comforts and luxuries of the purse-proud *parvenus* of the Finance. Invidious distinctions in society are certainly disappearing, and self-vanity has seldom occasion to be mortified ; but while these are the few advantages to be obtained from the levelling system, the distant politeness and formal courtesies which once distinguished the edu-

cated circles of France, are now giving way to familiarity without friendship, and obscenity without wit. Dignified urbanity is set down as arrogance, and respect to outward decorum ridiculed as prudery; while familiarity, and its natural companion, coarseness of manners, are considered as assertions of equality or pledges of citizenship.

These striking differences in the institutions as well as in the principles of England and France, should withhold a stranger in either country from judging hastily, or with national prejudices, the constitution and political establishments of his neighbours. The entire social organization of the two nations is essentially different, and perhaps the great cause of this difference is to be traced to the existence of primogeniture in one country and the fatal repeal of that law in the other. That the law should provide for the younger children by proportionate charges on the land, where no personal property is left in lieu of such charges, is just, if not politic; but to divide and subdivide real property, as is now practised in France, would destroy the foundation of all our national institutions, and remove the keystone of the social arch. The first consequence would be the utter annihilation of the small but independent landowners, who are constant residents on their estates, and tend more than any other body of men to preserve social order in the provinces. The real property, which now gives the head of a family both an interest in the welfare of his country and the means to support a useful popularity in his neighbourhood, would, when divided amongst six or more children, be perfectly insufficient to raise them to importance, or bind them in consequence to their ancestral home. The mansion would be left to ruins, the land entrusted to an agent, while the owners of the soil would spend its products in the dissipation of the capital, or an equally profitless sojourn abroad. Without the hope to found a wealthy family, or even the chance of saving from further division the hereditary estate, which hitherto marked their respectability, the numerous heirs of a small income would have little inducement to industry, and no prospective interests in the welfare of their country. Family pride is a powerful stimulant to good; and should the vanity which now makes the country gentleman court the poor with alms, and the independent by hospitality—which makes him woo the authority of a magistrate, and be offended if his name is not on the grand jury—should this vanity be for ever extinct, we know not if the agricultural districts of England would not rival in misery the worst specimens in Ireland. Absenteeism would exist, and all the evils of the sub-letting system be brought into practical effect. The great estates would gradually follow the fate of the

small ones, and that high-minded race, the brave and accomplished aristocracy of England, would dwindle into an insignificant tribe of idle tourists, or *petit-maitres* about town. Here and there a succession of barren marriages might leave a family in prosperity, or a castle standing; but they, like the ruins of a great city, would only loom in the desert as an index and a memento of departed days. The farmers and labourers must suffer in proportion as their landlords become impoverished and absenteeism prevails; and if hard times and misfortunes should lower on the country, where would be the men of substance who could face the danger and weather the storm? If any one doubts the effects of destroying the law of primogeniture, let him study the state of France, and weigh well its fatal consequences there: the rural districts are deserted by all that is wealthy or accomplished, while the provincial government is conducted by subalterns deputed from the capital. A stranger who mingles in French society must be struck with the indifference to legislative details amongst the independent sons of gentlemen, and how completely the affairs of the nation are conducted by men of an inferior grade in society. The pursuits of the nobility are various, their party predilections violent, and their thirst for fame exorbitant; but yet domestic politics—practical questions of government—the commercial prosperity of the country, or its municipal legislation—are matters quite foreign to their education or taste. They are elated by a national victory, and they boast their unflinching adherence to a dynasty, but none of them studiously prepare themselves for the part of a legislator, or store up experience to be employed some future day in the cabinet. They ever affect to condemn such tedious studies, and hasten to the capital, to dissipate in pleasure their fractional portion of the patrimonial estate. The origin of this inexperience, as well as indifference to the more minute details of a political life, accrues from the circumstance of their having no future post to look forward to, and the certainty that their small fortunes cannot ensure them importance in their own departments. They see themselves and their families sinking gradually in the scale of society, and like desperate men, make merry with the little which is saved from the wreck. The same causes would produce the same effects in England, and we should then have the many evils without the few advantages of centralization. The excellence of our roads, the abundance of our country markets, the general diffusion of civilization, and the flourishing state of our country towns, owe their origin and continuance to the resident landed gentry. Having artificial wants as well as a little state to keep up, they give encouragement to various trades and

institutions, which the townsmen and mere cultivators of the soil do not stand in need of. All this would fall with the baron's castle and the commoner's mansion. The moral and political respectability of England would sink in proportion as society became deteriorated and confused. Offices which are now filled by respectable country gentlemen, and seats in Parliament, which are the objects of contention between wealthy families, would fall into the hands of men having no stake in the country, and whose chief object would be to aggrandize themselves at the expense of the nation, regardless alike of the happiness of the people, or the advancement of sound and rational reform. Talented as several of the French Deputies are, they have neither the same practical knowledge of legislation, nor the same prompting personal interest in the country, as many an English nobleman. The consequence has been that England is marching on in prosperity, while France is ground down under the most galling and systematic tyranny in Europe.

ART. VI.—*First Report of the Commissioners of Inquiry into the State of the Irish Fisheries, with the Minutes of Evidence and Appendix. Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of His Majesty.* Dublin, 1836.

AMONG the various sources of profitable employment by which the industry of Ireland could be rendered available towards the increase of the comforts of the people and the prosperity of the empire, the fisheries are certainly entitled to a large share of attention. A very slight survey even of the geographical character of the island would alone be sufficient to confirm this position. Surrounded as it is by an ocean teeming with fish of every species calculated to gratify the most fastidious palate; indented with deep and spacious bays, in which the most numerous fleets ever launched by Great Britain in her most palmy days of nautical supremacy could ride in safety; with creeks and havens innumerable, into which smaller craft can have recourse for shelter on any unfavourable change of weather; with a dense population, no individual of which, let him locate himself as centrally as he will, can be more than fifty miles distant from the coast, so that the produce of the ocean could be served up to his table in a state almost as rife and healthy as he could enjoy it on the coast; with all these advan-

tages, it might be thought that fresh fish would form one great element of national sustenance. If the survey be extended to the relative situation of the island with respect to other parts of the civilized world, the speedy and safe communication that can be maintained between it and all the great ports of Europe, the Mediterranean, Africa, the whole of the eastern, that is, of the commercial coasts of both Americas and the West Indies, affords an opening to mercantile speculations on the grandest scale; and these, again, are peculiarly aided by the extreme facility of access to her ports, and their acknowledged security, already alluded to. The natural advantages which Ireland thus possesses in a commercial point of view, may be still more strongly illustrated by the fact, that, while Great Britain commands a scope of commerce unprecedented in the annals of any nation since the records of history commence, not a vessel engaged in any department of it, with the trifling exception of the Baltic trade, but must, both when outward and inward bound, pass by the Irish coast. This reflection might lead to many enlarged speculations as to the general relations of the country, melancholy enough as to the past, but cheering in prospect. At present the considerations arising from it must be confined to the fisheries. The irresistible conclusion respecting them in this point of view is, that Ireland should furnish not only an ample stock of fish for domestic consumption, but also a superabundance adequate to meet the most extended demand of the most extended commerce. If, to these two facts, the great internal supply of the article, and the boundless expanse of foreign communication, be added another, equally indisputable, that the great majority of the population at home, and a large proportion of that of those foreign countries most intimately connected with it in their commercial relations, are bound by a moral necessity, of most powerful influence, to make fish, whether fresh or cured, a portion, and no small portion, of their usual sustenance, the inquirer is driven irresistibly into the inference that Ireland ought to be the greatest fish-producing and fish-exporting country on the face of the globe. Now, the fact is directly the reverse. Instead of contributing anything towards foreign consumption, the supply falls so far short of the wants of her own population, that in this, as in other cases of similar import, she is starving in the midst of plenty. The people of Ireland are indebted for their chief supply of an article almost essential to their existence, to the industry and sagacity of their Scottish neighbours.

Why is this so? Why—if the land, for causes we shall not at present enter into, be in a great measure locked up against

the industry of her inhabitants—why is the sea, that is open to all, the sea that seems to have made the coasts of Ireland the chosen pleasure-ground, for every variety of creature that animates its depths;—where, from the cliffs that tower over the Atlantic, may be seen by day the whale and sunfish indulging in their unwieldy gambols, or basking in undisturbed tranquillity, and by night its surface beaming with interminable streaks of sparkling herring shoals, that come and go, and leave no trace behind—why is it, that the sea, which almost throws up its countless myriads of living provender upon its shores, is unavailing to alleviate, if not to prevent, the cry of destitution that incessantly moans over the land? It is not want of knowledge. The facts just stated are as notorious as they are extraordinary. From the earliest periods, notice is taken of the abundance of fish. The ancient records of the country, few as they are that still remain, afford evidence that this branch of industry was well known and duly regarded. In the reign of Edward IV it was made the subject of special legislation. An act of the fifth of that reign provides that no foreign vessel should fish on the banks near the Irish coast, unless on payment of an annual duty of 13s. 4d., no small sum in those days; thus proving that the acknowledged abundance of the article was at that time well known in the neighbouring countries, and that the domestic legislature, for this was an act of the Irish parliament, felt it their duty to extend over this department of native industry a protecting duty of the most unexceptionable kind against unlimited foreign interference. Philip II. of Spain, whose connexion with the Netherlands had doubtless made him acquainted with the full value of this element of national wealth, paid an annual sum of 1000*l.* for license to fish on the northern coasts of Ireland for twenty-one years. The Dutch purchased a similar privilege in the reign of Charles I, for which this thrifty and shrewd people thought 30,000*l.* not too high a price; and, during the period of the republic, the Swedes procured a permission, on similar terms, to employ a stated number of vessels in the Irish fisheries. That these indulgences did not materially interfere with the domestic trade appears from a passage in the works of Sir James Ware, who wrote in the time of James I, in which it is stated, that “among the advantages of Ireland, may be reckoned her great and plentiful fisheries of salmon, herring, and pilchards, which, salted and barrelled, are every year exported to foreign parts, and yield a considerable return to the merchants.” Instances of the public recognition of the extent and value of the Irish fisheries are not confined to the remoter periods. “The fisheries of Ireland,” says Sir Wil-

liam Temple, who wrote subsequently to the revolution, "might prove a mine under water as rich as any under ground." Young, in his valuable *Tour through Ireland*, in 1779, truly remarks, that "there is scarcely a part of Ireland but what is well situated for some fishing of consequence. Her coasts and innumerable creeks are the resort of vast shoals of herring, cod, ling, hake, mackerel, &c., which might, by proper attention, be converted into funds of wealth." Daniel, in his *Rural Sports*, says, that "the waters of Ireland abound in all that can invite an angler to their banks; perhaps they are better stored, and the fish contained in them of a size superior to those found elsewhere in the united empire." To quote the words of Wakefield, who travelled through the country in 1812, would be little more than to echo those of preceding writers. Want of knowledge, therefore, is not the cause of the depressed state of this branch of the natural resources. Neither is it want of industry. From the earliest periods, the native inhabitants of the western shores, where the harbours are most numerous, and the fish of every kind most abundant, are known to have been in the habit of launching out their little corachs, ribbed with osiers and coated with hides, buffeting the billows of the Atlantic, and returning home laden guanel deep; less rejoiced, perhaps, at the plentiful addition they were thus contributing to the relief of their anxious families at home, than grieved at being compelled to relinquish the still greater abundance their scanty means of conveyance compelled them to leave behind. Even at the present day, the reports of the Commissioners of Inquiry, with which the reader will be made better acquainted by and by, state, that when the herrings drift in large shoals into the immediate vicinity of the shores, the inhabitants of the coast villages are in the habit of clubbing their blankets to form them into a kind of clumsy net for their capture; they themselves, their wives and children, submitting to the want of covering in the best manner they can, until the fishing is over. In the southern counties, the adventurous young men, finding that domestic employment, either on land or water, holds out no adequate remuneration, proceed across the Atlantic to Newfoundland, whence some return with the earnings of one or more seasons, while others are induced to expatriate themselves altogether, and to make that bleak and desolate region of fog and loneliness the seat of their permanent residence. It is not, therefore, want of industry. What then can be the cause?

In attempting to solve this problem, we shall commence by a statement of the causes to which this state of things has been generally attributed; and then, without presuming to intrude

upon the reader any speculative hypothesis of our own, that might, on a still more enlarged investigation—for we are not ashamed to confess, that it is a question to excite our feelings as well as to engage our understandings—prove equally unfounded in principle, and fallacious in result, as any of those that have been hazarded and proved futile, we shall detail, concisely but accurately, the attempts made, from time to time, to fix this department of national industry upon a solid footing, describe its position and bearings at the present moment, and then leave to common sense to follow out the subject to a sound and legitimate conclusion, as to the ulterior measures best suited to restore it to its ancient state of efficiency.

The present depressed state of the fisheries of Ireland has been attributed to the following causes—the poverty of the fishermen, their ignorance and prejudices, the want of shelter for their craft, injudicious laws and restrictions, and the frequency of wars.

Poverty is a charge which has been brought against fishermen in all ages of the world, from the Ichthyophagi with whom Menelaus was condemned to mess during his disastrous voyage homewards from Troy, to the native Australians of our own days; yet, poor as the vocation is, it did not prevent the Dutch from embarking in it, and persevering in it so as to render it a source of comfortable subsistence for no small portion of their population, and of revenue and greatness to their country; neither has it prevented the population in many of the maritime villages of England from procuring from it, for themselves and their families, if not the comforts enjoyed by the agricultural peasantry, at least a certain elevation in social existence, adequate to maintain them several degrees above that state of squalid destitution which the Irish peasant deems alone deserving of being branded with the name of poverty. The poverty of the Irish fisherman, therefore, does not proceed merely from his being of that vocation. It may tend to prevent his rising into some more profitable line of living; but it exerts no necessary influence to depress him into beggary. His ignorance, the second cause, is the natural—the necessary—result of his poverty; and as to his prejudices they are but an additional link in this chain of causes and effects. In confirmation of the position, that the destitution, ignorance, and prejudices of this class in Ireland arise from circumstances extraneous to their mode of life, we shall, instead of entering into abstract theoretical disquisitions, adduce the actual state of the fishermen of Claddagh, as given in Hardiman's History of the town of Galway, and shall make no apology for deviating somewhat from the direct course

of our enquiry, because, while the episode is not without its connexion with the main subject, it serves to introduce to notice a genus, or, more correctly speaking, a variety of the *Homo Hibernicus*, little known, yet worthy of being studied from the singularity of its distinctive characteristics. Let the reader compare the following graphic description of the insulated village of Claddagh, insulated not physically but morally, for strictly speaking it is a suburb of the populous town of Galway, with his recollections of the inland Irish peasant, as painted by the still more graphic and equally accurate pens of Edgeworth, Carleton, or Inglis; and he must acknowledge that the former exists in a better, a purer moral atmosphere than his brother agriculturists and mechanics of the inland districts :

“ The Claddagh is a village in the western suburb of Galway, inhabited by about 3000 individuals, who support themselves solely by fishing ; they have no land attached to their cottages ; a milch cow and a potatoe garden are equally rare among them. The colony, from time immemorial, has been governed by one of their own body, periodically elected, who is called the mayor, and regulates the community according to laws understood among themselves : his decisions are always final. When on shore, the villagers are occupied in fitting up their boats and tackle for the next expedition ; and spend their leisure in regaling themselves with their favourite beverage, whiskey, or assembling in groups to consult about their maritime affairs. When preparing for sea, they take out potatoes, oaten bread, fire, and water, but no spirituous liquor. On returning from the fishing, where they are often absent for several days, they are met by their wives and female relations on the shore, to whom they hand over the whole of their capture, which forthwith becomes the sole property of the women, who dispose of it at pleasure, the men troubling themselves no farther about it, and contenting themselves with what money is necessary for the repair of their boats, and whatever whiskey, brandy, and tobacco their wives choose to allow them. They are ignorant ; they speak no language but Irish ; they have no schools, contenting themselves and their families with the religious instruction they receive from the convent church of the village, which is most liberally supported by them. So secluded and orderly are their general habits, that they are scarcely thought of in the town of Galway, on the borders of which they reside, except indeed on the festival of St. John, one of their great gala days, when the whole male community parade the streets dressed in their holiday clothes, with banners flying, and other rural antic devices to attract the attention, and excite the merriment of the spectators.”

Here we see that the Claddagh men, so far from being in the state of necessity that goads almost irresistibly to vice and crime, live and have lived, from generation to generation, in comfort and content, subject only to those occasional depressions which the

vicissitudes of the elements, or general and sudden political changes, must produce upon them as well as on every other class which depends upon daily labour for subsistence; and, therefore, must infer, that if the generality of the fishermen in other districts be different, the effect is attributable to circumstances unconnected with the nature of their employment.

The next cause to which the present depressed state of the fisheries has been attributed, is the want of safety harbours and piers. The truth of this is as indisputable as the fact itself is discreditable to the government, which had neglected a necessary means of preserving the lives, and securing the properties, of so valuable and numerous a portion of the population under its care. The fourth cause is injudicious legal regulations and restrictions. Of this we must speak as of the preceding in terms of reluctant confirmation. To give but two examples—for to unravel the tissue of vicious legislation through all its tortuous aberrations, would lead into a detail equally painful and interminable—the effects of the salt duties upon the fishing trade are thus described by Fraser, in his valuable review of the Domestic Fisheries of Great Britain and Ireland:—

“Before the duty on salt was imposed, there were refineries for rock salt, not only at Wexford, but almost at every fishing village along the whole of the Irish coast. These small refineries have long been given up at Wexford and all the smaller towns and villages along the coast, and are now (1818) confined, on the eastern and south-eastern coast, to Dublin and Waterford by which this valuable necessary of life is become in a great degree a monopoly in the hands of a few individuals, and the price thereby greatly enhanced to the public: a drawback, it is true, is allowed to decked fishing-vessels proceeding from Dublin and some other ports for the herring fisheries, and for those of cod, ling, and hake; but the boat fishery along these extensive coasts, where fish of every kind abound in the greatest profusion, are not entitled to any such indulgence. Before the period when this destructive tax was imposed, there was not a cottage along the whole of the coast that did not enjoy the luxury of a winter barrel of herring, cod, or the delicious hake, a delicacy now wholly unknown to any family under the description of a considerable landed proprietor, or a wealthy merchant or farmer.”—p. 127.

When our legislators imposed these extravagant and impolitic duties upon salt, they did so with their eyes open. They foresaw that the enforcement of the duty must extinguish the fishing trade. To prevent such a consequence, they allowed a drawback on all salt used in the curing of fish. But, like many other legislative measures of those days, the remedy proved as bad as the disease. Wholesale merchants and extensive manufacturers, who annually turn a capital to the amount of hundreds

of thousands, may feel the beneficial effect of a drawback which lightens, even in a small degree, their pecuniary pressure; but to a fisherman, whose all is at risk in a single venture, whose whole capital and credit are laid out in the outfit of his open boat, his nets and tackle—what is its effect on him? Infallibly this—he is tempted by the lure of the drawback to adventure his all; but, when the period of repayment comes round, he finds himself entangled in a maze of checks and counterchecks, certificates and affidavits, so that the mere loss of time in claiming the drawback costs him more than any benefit he could derive from the return of this portion of his outlay. “The case is very well put in the report for 1822 of the former commissioners of fisheries:

“The commissioners consider it important to the subject matter of this report to offer a few observations on the impediments the fisheries of Ireland experience from the many forms required by the existing regulations of the customs’ department, ere an exemption from the duty of salt used in the cure of fish can be obtained by the curer. The complexity of these forms effectually excludes the poorer fish-curers from the benefit of this exemption. The advantages, therefore, held out by the fishery enactments are rendered useless to the greater portion of petty curers; and the result is, the necessity of purchasing their salt in small quantities, subject to the full or duty-paid price, and to abandon as an unavoidable alternative, all thought of seeking a repayment of duty, in consequence of forms to them incomprehensible, and therefore impracticable.”—*Report of the Commissioners of Irish Fisheries in 1822.*

True it is, that the salt duty has been repealed; and that, therefore, the evil is no longer felt. But the ulcer does not heal up instantaneously on the removal of the cause of irritation. Bloodletting is useful; but you may bleed and bleed, on the Sangrado system, until the animal functions are so far exhausted as to paralyze the principle of vitality necessary to close the orifice, and the patient dies of exhaustion. The timber duties afford another instance of mischievous interference; in illustration of the effects of which we refer to the evidence adduced in the report of the Commissioners of Fishery Enquiry, which has been just published:

“There are three ship carpenters employed in Balbriggan, eight in Skerries, and three in Rush. These men derive employment at present only in repairing boats; and this is curtailed by the practice of having boats repaired in the Isle of Man, because Baltic timber, being exempt from duty there, repairing is less expensive than at home. Masts, &c. cannot be bought there and fitted at home, without paying the import duties; repairs are therefore necessarily completed in that island.”—*Fishery Report, 1836, Evidence, p. 2.*

This source of most impolitic restriction, both as to the timber trade itself and to the fisheries, still continues in operation. One instance more is adduced, not indeed on account of its prejudicial effects, for it is so absurd as to be perfectly harmless; but as a ludicrous example of that spirit of official intermeddling that must be doing something—"The boats of fishermen must be painted black!" The legislation of Trinculo and Stephano in the *Tempest* is oracular when compared with this. Yet the law is not the offspring of olden ignorance and prejudice; not the effusion of unreformed official coxcombicality—it is one of the provisions of a statute of the 3d. and 4th of Wm. IV. chap. 53, sect. 13.

Frequent and sudden alternations of war and peace have been adduced as another cause for the depressed state of the fisheries of Ireland. Their effects on those of the empire generally, are well pointed out in Fraser's work, already alluded to:

"The fisheries for the supply of the London market were begun to be carried on in vessels with wells for keeping the fish alive, after the Dutch method, in 1712, when three well-boats were fitted out at Harwich, and the number gradually encreased to 30, until war breaking out with France in 1744, many of the fishermen laid up their vessels or sold them. On the restoration of peace in 1748, their number was increased to 97 sail; but hostilities again commencing in 1756, the fishing was interrupted, until the peace of 1763, when the fishing again revived, and continued until a new war with France in 1778. During this war, the trade was for a time maintained through a mutual understanding of the fishermen of both countries; but in 1780, the Dutch privateers having captured several of the English boats, it was given over until the peace of 1783. The last war with France, which commenced in 1793, was not calculated to encourage the enterprise of the fishermen, and the trade for the supply of the London market fell still lower."—*Fraser's Review*, p. 5.

This cause cannot affect the case at present. Upwards of twenty years of tranquillity, undisturbed by any actual interruption, or even by any apparent prospect of such a calamity, ought to have afforded time enough, were war a main cause of injury, to have set this branch of national industry on a proper footing.

After this cursory view of the causes to which the present depressed state of the fisheries of Ireland have been attributed, we proceed to enquire what has been done towards their removal. The first measure adopted was the bounty system. The unsoundness of the principle on which this system rests is now so fully acknowledged, that any enlargement on it for the purpose of exposing its futility would be mere waste of time. Yet, as a

matter of curiosity, it may not be amiss to give an instance of its practical effect in Ireland. The Irish act for the encouragement of the trade by bounties was passed in 1764. The average quantity of herrings imported into Ireland for nine years immediately preceding that period was 25,000 barrels; the average for nine years immediately succeeding it was 42,000 barrels, being an annual increase of 17,000 barrels of the imported article during the operation of the bounty system. The total quantity of herrings *imported* during the former of these periods was 225,000 barrels; during the latter, 380,000 barrels. The total quantity *exported* from Ireland during the same periods respectively were 51,000 barrels in the former, and 35,000 in the latter; thus showing an *increase* of 155,000 barrels in the *imported* article, and a *decrease* of 16,000 in the *exported*, during the time in which the domestic production was favoured by the bounty. It is not, however, for the mere purpose of an ironical display of the collective wisdom of the Irish legislature—for the bounty system was not peculiar to that portion of the empire—that the illustration has been given. The system, notwithstanding all the advances since made in the theory of Political Economy, is still extremely fascinating. There exists in the interior agency of every government a tendency to suffer some portions of the public money to slip into the pockets of favoured individuals under the specious plea of promoting the public interest. Notwithstanding the exposure of the system, arising from the publicity of the facts just stated, it still continued to be the chief means resorted to for stimulating the national industry on this point; for, except a grant of £6000, in 1801, in furtherance of an abortive plan for supplying London with fresh fish from the Nymph bank, off the coast of Waterford, which was represented as capable of yielding an inexhaustible supply of round fish, nothing further was done until 1819, when the Irish fishery board was established, and supplied with ample means for carrying into effect the object for which it was created.

The proceedings of this body form an epoch in the history of the subject now under consideration. Its objects were to procure a full supply of fish for the home market; and, by converting what had been hitherto an import into an export trade, to make it a staple article in our commerce with other countries. The data the board had to act upon were few, but sufficiently satisfactory. The abundance of the article was acknowledged on all hands; the failure of all previous attempts to turn that abundance to profitable account was equally acknowledged. It remained for them, by a discovery of the true causes of this paradox, to suggest measures for effecting a safe and effectual

remedy to the disease. Their means were ample—a large annual grant of public money was entrusted to their management.

The commissioners commenced by following the course hitherto pursued. They renewed, or, more correctly speaking, continued on an enlarged scale—for it had never been wholly relinquished—the system of bounties, guarding it, however, as they thought, by checks and provisos sufficiently powerful to prevent the recurrence of the frauds that had hitherto baffled all previous precautions. The result of these bounties, together with the other measures acted on during the ten years of the Board's existence, produced an effect, apparently confirmatory of the correctness of their views on this point: the number of boats and of men engaged in the fisheries was considerably increased. The numbers of each at the commencement and termination of the Board's labours appear in their returns as follows:—

			1821.	1820.
Boats—decked	-	-	294	345
half-decked	-	-	421	791
open sailing	-	-	2,051	2,483
rowing	-	-	4,889	9,522
Men	-	-	36,159	64,771

A comparison of these two dates shows, that while the new system produced a small increase in the number of the larger and more costly vessels, that of the small craft and of the individuals engaged in the fisheries was nearly doubled. The quantity of herrings cured in each of the years named in the preceding table was as follows:

	Barrels.		Barrels.		Barrels.
1822 -	12,122	1829 -	16,855	Increase-	4,733.

No very great increase as the result of seven years' bounties. It must also be stated, on the one hand, that the quantity of hake brought under bounty had increased during this period from 9,393 cwt. to 32,160 cwt.; and, on the other, that during the same period the imports of Scotch fish, instead of diminishing, increased considerably; the imports of cured fish from that country being—

		1822.	1829.
Herrings (barrels)	-	56,528	89,680
Round fish (cwts.)	-	5,907	8,046

While in some of the years intervening between these two limits, the quantities imported from Scotland were considerably larger than those stated in the item of 1829.

The preceding calculations, as to the effects of the Commissioners' operations, have been here attributed to the Bounties; because their other measures were subsequent, and of slow operation. We now proceed to those other measures. The trade

suffered much injury from the want of convenient landing places, and harbours of shelter in case of foul weather. The fishermen were often deterred from putting to sea through the apprehension of foul weather; or after venturing out, either in consequence of the deceptive appearance of the sky, or the impulse of imperious necessity, they were often driven by a sudden gale on a lee coast, where their frail craft was staved, and loss of life too frequently the consequence. The commissioners, therefore, partly from their parliamentary grant, and partly with the pecuniary assistance afforded them by the London Distress Committee, and by a few of the Irish landed proprietors, undertook the construction of fishing piers, and small safety harbours, chiefly on the western coast. The money thus expended, besides its direct operation in providing places of security for the fisherman and his vessel in the most exposed situations, had the further effect, like that of the bounties, of circulating a large sum in the poorest and most neglected districts of Ireland—a portion of which, at least, must, by some of the circuitous revolutions of capital, find its way into the fisherman's cottage, and thus assist in some degree in furnishing enlarged means for a better outfit of his boat and tackle. The same effect was, in a certain degree, produced by a direct donation of money in certain cases, for the purchase and repairs of boats and gear. Still further to promote the circulation of capital, the commissioners, under the authority of a special act, established a loan fund to a large amount, by means of which the wants of the poor fisherman on every part of the coast were to be relieved, either by supplies of materials necessary for the repairs of his boat, or of hooks, lines, nets, and other apparatus, or even by a new boat; the repayment to be secured by a promissory note from the borrower, and two securities, payable in twelve months, with interest at 5 per cent.

Having thus enumerated the remedial measures adopted by the board, we proceed to the investigation of their results. The expenditure during its ten years' existence, is given by the commissioners as follows :

	£.	s.	d.
Bounties - - - -	150,637	2	8
Fishing piers and quays -	22,978	11	4
New boats, repairs, and tackle -	16,530	6	10
Salaries and incidents -	55,064	13	0

Total Expenditure in ten years £245,210 13 10

The most remarkable item in this statement, is the amount of salaries and official incidents, being more than a fourth of the

sum laid out on all the other departments. Such a lavish expenditure, under the immediate eye of the principals, must excite strong doubts as to the strictness of their superintendence over the outlay of the other items of the charge. Of sixty-eight piers and harbours commenced by the board, fifty-five have been completed, seven of which have been destroyed or much injured, partly by the violence of the sea, partly by defective construction. The sum affixed to this item in the preceding statement, does not exhibit the whole of the expenditure, as in all cases the commissioners were bound down to require that one-fourth, at least, of the expense should be contributed from other sources, which was effected partly by grants from charitable associations, and partly by the contributions of the landed proprietors, who had a personal interest in the proceeding. The amount of fish cured under the bounty system, was 216,733 barrels, and 235,391 cwt. From the expenditure in the shape of donations, for boats, repairs, and tackle, no specific inference can be drawn, because there is no ostensible return from it. It is so much money sunk, and may or may not have been productive of good. The loan-fund does not appear in the preceding statement. It arose from the accumulation of unclaimed grants for bounties or fishing-piers, which the commissioners were authorized to appropriate in the manner deemed by them best calculated to promote the main object of the commission. These accumulations are stated to have amounted to £17,363. The documents before us relative to this department of the concern are very scanty, and ill calculated to throw light upon it. All that can be collected from them is, that after the close of the commission in 1830, and after a double transfer of the powers and documents of the board, first to the Commissioners of Inland Navigation, and subsequently to the Commissioners of Public Works, the account is stated as follows :

4th Sept. 1830	Transferred to the Directors-General of	£.	s.	d.
	Inland Navigation - - -	2,836	11	9
8th Oct. 1831.	Arrears received by them - -	3,428	0	1
		6,264	11	10
	Deduct expenses in recovering loan	1,024	11	3
	Transferred to the Commissioners of	5,240	0	7
	Public Works - - - - -			
31st Dec. 1835.	Arrears received by them - -	2,129	3	8
		7,369	4	3
	Deduct expenses in recovering loans	465	2	2
		6,904	2	1

On perceiving, as this statement shews, that out of a capital of £17,300, which was to be turned annually, with an accumulating interest at £5 per cent, somewhat less than £7,000 appears to its credit: learning also, from the same document, that an expense of £1,500 has been incurred in collecting the arrears, and that the total amount thus recovered is but £5,557, the inference is irresistible, that the system of loan funds, as applied to the relief of the fishing interest, and as managed by the Boards of Fisheries and of Inland Navigation and of Works, is a discreditable failure. The piers and quays speak for themselves. They are of permanent utility, though perhaps in some instances injudiciously placed, or defective in construction; and form the smallest item in the account, not amounting to half of the office expenditure. The only cause of regret respecting them is, that the system was not commenced much earlier, and carried on with much more vigour and duration. When we look back at the millions lavished on martello towers, and signal-posts, and barracks, most of which are now mouldering away, or standing idle, merely as monuments of the follies and extravagance of war, our regret is still more heightened, that some part at least of the expenditure had not been devoted to a purpose much more efficient towards the prosperity and stability of the empire. The effects of the bounties, which absorbed by far the greater part of the fund, can be best estimated by the state of the fisheries since the close of the commission. It was not to be expected that its labours were to be continued for ever; that an expenditure of bounties, and grants, and loans, and salaries, was to be continued from year to year, in an increasing ratio, indefinitely. The intention of the liberality of parliament was, by giving an artificial stimulus, for a time, to a disorganized and depressed portion of the national resources, to excite them to a new energy, sufficient to give rise to a healthy action, and to enable them to be carried on permanently, according to the usual unaided calculations of profit and loss of other mercantile speculations. Ten years were abundantly sufficient for the experiment. The system adopted by the commissioners, undoubtedly, had the effect of giving an extraordinary stimulus to the trade during its existence. The number of men drawn into it, increased, as has been seen, in a wonderful manner; the population engaged in the fisheries nearly doubled itself during that period, and the quantity of fish caught was also considerably increased. But what have been its permanent effects, from which only we can draw a satisfactory conclusion? As to the latter, the amount of fish taken, though there are no official means at home for ascertaining it, we learn, from the Scotch fishery reports, that the quantities imported from that

country have increased, thus proving the failure of one of the main objects of the Irish commission—the exclusion of the foreign article, by the production of a sufficiency for domestic supply; and, as to the latter—the number of fishermen—a return from the coast-guard officers, in 1835, states it to be, in this latter year, 54,119, shewing a diminution of upwards of 10,000 in five years, to be accounted for only by one of two suppositions—either a fallacious return of the late board, (which we have neither inclination nor grounds to impute to them) or, (which we believe to be the true cause) the operation of an unwholesome stimulus, the effect of which ceased with the cessation of its application.

The commission of 1820 was, therefore, a failure. But it has not been, or at least we vain would hope that it will not be, without its use. It was an experiment dearly paid for, no doubt—an apprenticeship, at an exorbitant fee it must be acknowledged, to train our rulers, by an experience of past error, into a better track in future. They seem to have taken the hint; they have not turned away, in despair, from the contemplation of the project; they have not relinquished the idea of making the Irish fisheries available, of rendering them what they ought to be, and what they might long since have been, under steady and economical management, a source of profitable employment to a large and most valuable class of the population, and of increased commercial advantage to the empire. But neither have they at once plunged into the details of an expensive and intricate machinery; they have not rashly entangled themselves in a maze of bounties, and donations, and loans,—doubtful, if not more than doubtful, as to the soundness of principle, and distracting by their minuteness and intricacy of detail. They have commenced by investigation. They appointed a commission of inquiry, to examine into the actual state of the subject, to collect all the information that the history of the miscalculations and misconduct of past times could afford, and to report the result. That report is now before us. It contains much valuable matter, evidently compiled with caution and judgment. We have derived from it several useful suggestions, and were prepared to specify many passages in confirmation of the views we have laid before our readers, particularly respecting the practical working of the bounties and loans; several of these are extremely curious, and strongly illustrative of the difficulties to be contended against in the management of the distribution of a public fund, in aid of the efforts of individual industry. But we must pass them over, convinced that the general views already given here of the workings of these per-

nicious systems, bear us out fully in our inferences, without entering more at large into the particulars by which they can be corroborated. The report, in addition to the detail of evidence taken before the commissioners throughout the maritime districts, which forms by much the greater part of a large and closely printed folio, gives a copious abstract of the proceedings of the former board, to which we have so often referred, as also communications respecting the fisheries in several of the kingdoms of Europe, from the constituted authorities of each. These also we pass over,—not from a wish to underrate their value, for they contain many particulars, the judicious application of which would tend greatly to assist the proceedings of a public body at home, in case the experience of the past shall warrant the formation of a new official department, instead of leaving the details to the unaided exertions of individual competition.

The report concludes with a summary of the commissioners' suggestions, as to the best mode of raising the fisheries from their present state of depression. "It is probably expected," say they, in the commencement of this summary, "that some proposition for a sudden improvement of the Irish fisheries will originate with this commission; but, whatever disappointment may arise from the confession, the commissioners feel it a duty to declare, that the result of their most anxious enquiries is a full persuasion that no means can be proposed for attaining, by any short process, so desirable an event." With the sentiment conveyed in this preamble, equally sensible and unassuming, we heartily concur. The inveterate abuses engrafted upon a system by prolonged mismanagement, cannot be eradicated by a single effort. The attempt would be but an idle display of political quackery. They then proceed to recommend, as the first step towards the regeneration of the system, the repeal of every act in any way relating to the sea-fisheries of Ireland, in order that all the provisions deemed necessary may be embodied in one statute. This suggestion also meets our hearty concurrence. The multiplication of laws is among the most crying evils under which we labour, in our present state of complicated and highly-wrought society: it is also an evil that presses more severely in proportion to the destitution of the class on which it acts. If, therefore, the fishermen be, as we fear they are under existing circumstances, among the poorest and most depressed of the industrious classes, they must feel in its greatest intensity the oppressive weight of such a system. The report then proceeds with a series of minor suggestions, all of which we feel inclined to treat in a very summary manner. They are, in fact, all

included in the first main suggestion of improved and simplified legislation, or emanate from this principle so immediately and directly, as to follow it in action as matter of course.

In the fisheries, as in other departments of the bygone Anglo-Irish system of government, ignorant, injudicious, often corrupt legislation, has done the mischief. The first, perhaps the only, needful remedy is, the doing away with the bad, in order to give fair play to the action of better, laws. When some loathsome object of disease is brought into an infirmary, the first operation he is subjected to is a thorough washing; and this preliminary process is often more than half the cure. Wash, scour away, with unwearied hand, the impurities contracted by years upon years of corrupt legislation; and then it will be seen how few, how simple, the new applications need be; how kindly, how rapidly, how effectually they will operate. It is unnecessary to point out what particular laws should be retained, what substituted, in the general clearance. With good intentions, with honesty of purpose to direct, common sense will easily point them out. From the peculiarity of the insular character of Ireland, her representatives, if they reside any time at home, must be acquainted with its maritime relations and capabilities. There are, therefore, means of knowledge amply sufficient to lead to sound legislation on the subject. There is also, we believe, sufficient honesty of purpose. The eyes of the legislature, likewise, are now directed upon Ireland. They cannot turn from it. They may be momentarily drawn away, to glance at Russia, or Spain, or France, or Turkey, or the Antipodes; but to Ireland they must revert, and that immediately. It is too close to them, it occupies too large a space in the scope of their political vision, not to be a primary object of contemplation. The Imperial Parliament, therefore, must legislate for Ireland. Among its legislative measures, the fisheries must be one object. They must be, we do not say the first or second, but among the leading objects of its agency. They afford a means of profitable employment to a most industrious, most peaceable, and most orderly portion of the community; they increase, or may be made to increase, to an indefinite degree, the means of subsistence for the whole population; they may be made a source of enlarged revenue; they may form a new opening for commercial enterprise; they may be converted into a powerful arm of national defence. Ireland, we beg to repeat it, is an island gifted with an extraordinary range of coast, as compared with its acreable contents; and still further gifted in the equally extraordinary capabilities of that coast towards the nautical advantages of the empire. Lycurgus, when he was

recasting his country in the mould of soldiership, cried out, "Let me have walls of men, not of brick." The battles of Great Britain must be fought upon the open sea. The broad ocean is the field in which her trophies must be planted. What, then, should be the word of preparation with her legislators? Should it not be,—“Let us have a wall of seamen?” Fishermen, undoubtedly, are not seamen; but they are the *matériel* of seamanship. Here, then, is one among many points to which the attention of a legislature that seriously and sedulously devotes itself to the bettering the condition of the country should be directed. The process of improvement in it is comparatively easy. Much of the rubbish, the *débris* of a vicious system, has been cleared away, at least so far as to enable those who choose to follow up the process to see their way before them. The errors and evils of a previous bad system have been developed; the rudiments of a better are apparent. It remains to apply to this long-neglected element of national prosperity, a due share of that searching and invigorating spirit of reform which we hope and trust is now in active operation both in and out of parliament; and we have no fears as to the ultimate result.

ART. VII.—*Mémoire sur la Détermination de l'Echelle du Thermomètre de l'Académie del Cimento*: par M. G. Libri. *Annales de Chimie et de Physique*: par MM. Gay-Lussac et Arago. Vol. XLV.

IT has been fashionable to treat the Catholic religion as hostile to the pursuit of physical science. What motives it can be supposed to have for such hostility, Heaven knows. It surely could not fear that, from the study of astronomy, any objections could be drawn against transubstantiation, nor that chemistry or geology could overthrow its belief in purgatory. It is evident, in fact, that wherever any plausible charge has been made against her upon this head, it has not been connected with any supposed relation to Catholic dogmas, but only to the more general evidences of Christianity. In the painful transactions respecting Galileo, the solicitude of the parties concerned was not to prevent conclusions from his principles contrary to any point of doctrine held exclusively by Catholics, but to silence objections against the inspiration and veracity of the Bible. They took up the cause, not of Rome, nor of the Holy See, but

of Christianity in general; and, however mistaken they were, both in their opinions and in their mode of proceeding, it would be most unjust to charge them with any feeling, that doctrines contested between us and Protestants should be protected from the test of philosophical observation.

It is, however, upon the strength of Galileo's case, distorted and misrepresented as it has almost always been by Protestants, and by too many Catholics, and worse explained and defended as it has been by others, that this species of accusation has been made against Rome. It is not our intention, on the present occasion, to enter into its merits; because it deserves a more minute examination than the immediate subject of this paper will permit. We will only remark, that, putting aside that single and singular case, in which one particular opinion, and not any science, was censured, it would be impossible to prove, by facts, any aversion on the part of Rome to the prosecution of natural studies, much less any apprehensions of their results. At the very time of Galileo, Castelli, his favourite pupil, and Torricelli, the discoverer of the perfect vacuum, received every patronage; and the latter could with difficulty be induced to quit Rome for Florence, to stay there after Galileo's death. On the treatment which Borelli and others of the same school received in the Holy City, our subject will lead us more directly to treat. The elder Cassini, who succeeded Cavalieri, the preparer of the way for the infinitesimal calculus, at Bologna, was most honourably treated, and employed by the Pope; as was, at a later period, Bianchini. The former was allowed to draw his splendid meridian in the church of St. Petronio, in Bologna, the latter in Sta. Maria degli Angioli, at Rome. The learned Jesuit, Boscovich, pursued his studies and gave his public lectures, not merely unmolested, but honoured and employed, particularly in the examination and repairs of St. Peter's cupola, when it threatened to give way, in consequence of imprudent alterations in its buttresses. His "*Theory of Natural Philosophy*," (1758) has formed the base of many excellent works on the Newtonion Theory. But his contemporaries, the learned Fathers Jacquier and Leseur, of the order of St. Francis of Paul, in Rome, have certainly the merit of having published the best commentary on the illustrious English philosopher's works. (1739-42.) Jacquier was only twenty-eight years of age when the first part appeared; and he held the situation of Professor of Scripture in the college of Propaganda. This proves how little jealousy was felt respecting the philosophical or astronomical systems held by an expounder of Holy Writ. Jacquier continued to receive tokens of peculiar kindness from

the enlightened Pontiffs, Benedict XIV and his successors, to Pius VI, under whom he died.

Nor has there been, since his time, any want of learned and judicious philosophers in Rome, who have freely pursued their researches in every branch of science. Sir Humphrey Davy, it is well known, had many dear friends and associates in his chemical labours at Rome, where many of his experiments on the combustion of the diamond were performed. The operation of transfusion of blood, from the veins of one living person to another, was, we understand, first tried in the same city. The present Pope has laid out very large sums in the construction and furnishing of new museums of natural history, in the Roman University. Every branch of science is conducted in the public schools of that city, upon the most modern and most enlarged plans. Perhaps the only class-book, into which Cauchy's latest researches into the Calculus of Remainders has been admitted, is that lately published by Father Caraffa, for the Jesuits' public schools at the Roman College. But of these things, more on some other occasion: let us now to the matter more immediately on hand.

Upon the revival of letters, a rage seized the whole of Italy; innocent, though extravagant; useful, perhaps, although often absurd. This was in favour of Academies, which sprang up in every town, and gloried in giving themselves the most ridiculous names. The purpose of these voluntary aggregations seldom rose higher than the composition, recitation, and occasional publication, of sonnets, pastorals, lyrics, and the other infinite species of rhymed effusions, in which Italians abound; things, in general, of that standard which neither "gods, nor men, nor the columns" approve. Some, like the *Crusca*, at Florence, have indeed turned their verbal lucubrations to some better purpose; but even on this, the absurdity of its name, which literally means the *Bran-academy*, and the homeliness of its symbol, a bolting mill, were calculated to throw ridicule. Two academies, or, as we should now call them, societies, were, however, formed in the course of the seventeenth century, for a more useful and nobler purpose—the prosecution of science, by the combination of talent directed to different pursuits.

These were the Academy of the Lincei, (*Lyncæi*) at Rome, and that of the *Cimento*, at Florence. The history of one bears a considerable resemblance to that of the other. Each was planned and directed by one person, whose talents and influence enabled him to bring around him, and keep together, men of rare abilities; and, after a short duration, both came to their end, by the removal of their respective founders. During their

brief existence, both gave proof of indefatigable ardour, of sound views, and of encouraging success, in the pursuit of natural science. The name of the "*Cimento*," (*Experiment*) sufficiently explains the principle on which it planned its pursuits; the other, in choosing its title, allowed itself to be more tainted with the pedantry of the times; but still, in drawing it from the most sharp-sighted of animals, the lynx, wished to intimate that the constant observation of phenomena was the foundation of all natural philosophy.

The essay to which this article refers the reader, treats of the thermometers invented and used by the Florentine Academy. We notice it entirely on account of its containing the accusation, to which we alluded in the outset, founded on the history of that academy, that Rome was cruelly, nay, brutally, hostile to the pursuit of these studies. To understand the writer's attack, it may be necessary to premise, that the *Accademia del Cimento* was formed and supported by Leopold, brother to Ferdinand II, fifth Grand Duke of Tuscany. He opened it solemnly, on the 19th of June 1657. The members met at his house, being mostly, as well as himself and his royal brother, disciples of Galileo. They invented and constructed many valuable instruments, and made very interesting researches, communicated in papers published at the time, and afterwards reprinted by Targioni, in his history of the Academy.* After it had enjoyed nine years' existence, Prince Leopold accepted the Cardinal's hat, and the academy was dissolved.

The causes and history of this dissolution, are pretended to be stated by the writer before us. He tells us that "political motives induced Prince Leopold of Medici, Protector of the *Accademia del Cimento*, to solicit the hat; that his request was granted, only on condition that he should sacrifice the academy, over which he presided, to the implacable hatred which the Court of Rome bore to the memory and to the disciples of Galileo. Consequently the Academy of the *Cimento* was dissolved, and Borelli was seen begging in the streets of Rome; and Oliva, with his bones half broken by torture, saved himself by suicide from the fresh torments prepared by the Inquisition. Many original writings of Galileo and his disciples were committed to the flames." In another passage, the writer thus proceeds: "The proscription which fell upon the writings of the great men of Florence, did not spare their instruments. Those which were saved from destruction, were chiefly apparatus for show, of which little use was ever made. But those small ther-

* "*Atti e Memorie inedite dell'Accademia del Cimento*," 4 vols.

mometers, made with spirits of wine, and divided into fifty degrees, of which the academicians speak as agreeing perfectly one with another, were nowhere to be found.”—p. 354.

We hardly know how to characterize the condensation of mis-statements and calumnies which crowds these lines. Their author is an Italian, who declares that he has turned his attention most particularly to the history of science in Italy. He quotes no authority for his assertions; he makes them with the bold assurance of a man who is either only repeating well-known facts, or is entitled to full credit, as treating of matters within his peculiar sphere of information. And yet, from first to last, there is not a word of truth in what he speaks. We are anxious to prove this to the full, lest some of our over-zealous adversaries should be blindly led to adopt and repeat these foolish untruths, as they have done so many others.

And first, as to the imaginary cause of all this persecution—“the implacable hatred of the Church of Rome towards the memory and disciples of Galileo.” It is to be observed that the academy most religiously abstained from maintaining those opinions which had embroiled Galileo with the Inquisition, and confined itself chiefly to experimental philosophy. At the time that this hatred of Rome is represented as exercised even against inanimate apparatus, Father Kircher, a Jesuit, was busily engaged in that city, in constructing instruments; and even Galileo’s invaluable invention, the telescope, not only first received this name in the same city, but was best manufactured there, by Guiseppe Campani, Umbrian from S. Felice, and Eustachio Divini, from S. Severino, whose lenses and telescopes were sent to Florence, and even to Paris. It was a long way to go, as far as the banks of the Arno, to wreak vengeance on the memory of Galileo, by breaking scientific instruments, when the task might have been more easily accomplished nearer home.

But this charge of hostility to the pursuit of science falls, unluckily for this author, upon two popes, whose characters can best repel it. The first is Alexander VII, during whose reign the academy was founded and flourished. He was a man, as Giordani writes, “of mild manners, and an elegant Latin and Italian scholar;” or, as Botta describes him, “prudent, and a lover of learning.” (vol. vii. p. 136.) But Targioni has more completely let us into his character, as it interests us on the present occasion. He calls him “learned, a man of good taste, extremely fond of mechanics, and of experimental philosophy.” He informs us, and proves, by authentic documents, that Prince Leopold occasionally sent presents of apparatus to him. (vol. i. pp. 66, 264, 465; ii. part 1, p. 337.) Again, whom should

Leopold choose to revise the Essays of the Academy, but Monsignor Michelangelo Ricci, a Roman prelate attached to the personal service of this pope and his successors, and a regular correspondent of the academy; and Megalotti, born, educated, and living in Rome? And before the work was quite printed off, the sheets were sent, through the learned Octavius Falconieri, member of the academy, to Cardinal Sforza Pallavicino, one of the pope's most confidential friends, who wrote that he had perused them with great delight. (*Turgioni*, vol. i. pp. 416, 455.)

This intimate connexion and correspondence surely looks more like a good understanding between Rome and the Academy, than implacable hostility on the part of one against the other. The Pope who bestowed the purple on Prince Leopold was Clement IX, a Tuscan no less than his predecessor Alexander; and the accusation must be still more harmless when made against him. Both before and after his promotion he was a devoted friend of the Medici, and consequently not likely to feel such hatred, as has been described, against the Academy which they so much cherished. But where was it likely that he should have imbibed this mortal antipathy to the memory of Galileo? For his philosophical studies had been made at Pisa, under the direction of the celebrated Benedetto Castelli, the dearest friend and scholar that Galileo ever had, and his successor in that University. The Pope, moreover, was the protector of Cassini, and of Monsignor, afterwards Cardinal Ricci, whom we have already named. This reasoning, however, may appear to amount to no more than a plausible argument; positive confutations will be easily found.

Monsignor Angelo Fabroni, in his *Life of Clement IX*, assures us that he had originally believed the story of the Pope's having stipulated for the dissolution of this Academy when he granted the Cardinal's hat to Leopold. But the perusal of the original correspondence upon the subject, between the Holy See and the Tuscan Minister, Montanti, completely satisfied him that it was false. For there was not even a distant allusion to any such stipulation. Indeed, so far from Leopold having solicited the purple, from political or any other motives, and consequently having to submit to any conditions, Clement was the first to write to the Duke that he had reserved a hat for one of his brothers. And having learnt that Leopold and Matthias both aspired to the dignity, he offered to bestow it upon both, as their virtues and acquirements rendered them both worthy of it. Hence, Targioni, who is ever inclined to suspect enmity to the Academy from every quarter, and who in the first volume had expressed a suspicion that the elevation of Leopold had con-

tributed to its extinction, in the subsequent part retracts his opinion, and expresses his conviction to the contrary.

How then, it may be asked, did this useful institute so soon come to an end? We answer, from natural and evident causes. It was never formally closed or dissolved, but fell into decay. In the first place, its principal and most active members, Borelli, Oliva and Rinaldini, spontaneously abandoned Florence about the same time. This Leopold assigns as a cause of the decay of his academy two months after his promotion, though he speaks of it as still existing. (*Lettere inedite d'Uomini illustri*, tom. i. p. 462.) Rinaldini had been an engineer in the service of Popes Urban VIII and Innocent X, and preceptor to the Princes Barbarini, of the first-named Pope's family. He afterwards occupied a chair at Pisa, and then became preceptor to the heir-apparent. In 1667 he requested permission to quit Tuscany on account of his health, and retired to Padua, whence he returned to his native city, Ancona, where he died. Now, Targioni informs us that his departure "greatly displeased Prince Leopold, because it *thwarted the progress* of the academy." So far were they from any idea even then of dissolving it, though the negotiations about the Cardinalship must have been then completed. In the two following years the Cardinal himself made journeys to Rome, and thus still further led to the disorganization of the body. Indeed, before he accepted the hat, he complained, and Megalotti, in his preface to the *Transactions of the Academy*, confirms the complaint, that the Prince's numerous occupations had, for some time, prevented him from interesting himself as he wished in these his favourite pursuits. (*Targ.* i. p. 424.)

In fact, so little aware were the most intimate friends of the Tuscan Prince, that the academy was to be dissolved, that Megalotti wrote to him from Antwerp, proposing a new member, a learned convert, in place of one of the three who had left it. "Truly," he says, "in the present dispersion of the Academy, by the departure of Borelli, Oliva, and Rinaldini, nothing could be more desirable; and if the other two places could be equally well filled up, we should be pretty well consoled for our loss." He then observes that Borelli, though possessed of splendid talents, was "a capricious and almost intolerable man." (*Lettere inedite*, i. p. 295.) In fine, as late as 1669, Borelli speaks of the Academy as still existing, nearly three years after Leopold's promotion. (*Historia et Meteorologia Incendii Etnæi Pref.*) So that, although the Academy may be said to have virtually expired three years before, it is evident that it cannot be affirmed to have been suppressed by the Pope, or by any one else.

Hence, Botta, no friend to the Papal See, attributes its dissolution to the discord among its members, and to the elevation of Leopold. But he expressly observes that it was not molested by the Court of Rome, under Alexander. The suppression then is all a fable, as is its alleged motive. So far from any hatred existing in Rome to the memory of Galileo, we should rather say that it was held in veneration. In the first edition of Borelli's great posthumous work, *De Motu Animalium*, now before us, printed at Rome in 1680, with all the usual approbations of the ecclesiastical authorities, we find the learned editor, Father Charles a Jesu, General of the order of the *Scuole pie*, boasts of one of his body as having been "*Galilei clarissimi viri auditor*:" an expression which does not betray feelings at all akin to hatred or hostility.

So much, then, for the barter of a Cardinal's hat against the suppression of a scientific society. Next comes the more odious charge of Borelli's beggary, and Oliva's broken bones. It does not require great sagacity to ask the question, what on earth could have taken these two men to Rome, if such a lot awaited them? Supposing their Academy to have been suppressed by an act of papal bigotry, can we imagine them, if sane, to have thrown themselves personally within the reach of the hatred that had shown itself so implacable in their regard as disciples of Galileo? For it is not even pretended that, like their master, they were summoned to Rome, or commanded even to quit Florence. The truth is, that the whole is a fiction, like the torture of that illustrious man. A brief account of their history will fully explain the matter.

Borelli, after having studied mathematics in Rome, under Father Castelli, taught the sciences at Messina, whence he was invited by the Grand Duke into Tuscany in 1656. Two years later he travelled to Rome for the purpose of studying Arabic, as he wished to translate, from that language, the books lost in Greek of Apollonius's Conic Sections. For this end he took lessons from Abraham Echellensis, a learned Syrian, author of several valuable works. In March 1667, while Alexander VII yet sat, and consequently before there was the least idea of Leopold's elevation to the purple, much less of any conditions to be made upon the occasion, Borelli requested leave to quit Tuscany, and return to Messina. (*Lett. ined.* i. 133. *Targ.* i. 215.) Redi, in one of his letters, tells us that the Prince was exceedingly displeased at his departure; and Fabroni has given a letter from the Duke to his brother, in which he complains of Borelli's conduct, and says that the fickleness of his disposition, and the restlessness of his brain, and not his health, were the

motives of his departure. (i. 135.) Marini has recorded a gross insult which Borelli and Oliva received from some drunken guards at the palace, which may have contributed to their wish to quit. (*Nelli, Saggio Letterario*, p. 116.) At Messina, Borelli lived in some splendour, till 1674, when he thought proper to take an active part in the insurrection that happened there. He saved himself from justice by flight, and arrived at Rome in great distress. The patronage and liberality of Christina, Queen of Sweden, enabled him to pursue his studies, till her circumstances became embarrassed, and at the same time a worthless servant robbed him of all he possessed. In all this there is no sign of any papal persecution, nor would it be easy for the most ingenious tracer of cause and effect to establish a connexion between his sufferings, and hatred on the part of Rome to the scholars of Galileo. But even at this period, Borelli was not reduced to the necessity of seeking alms. He accepted the invitation of the Fathers of the *Scuole pie* to live in their house and teach mathematics. Here he gave himself up to a life of edifying devotion, charming every one by his cheerfulness and amenity, till his death, which happened in the last hour of the year 1679. His work *De Motu Animalium* appeared the next year, through the bounty of Queen Christina.

Such is the simple narrative of Borelli's history; Oliva's presents a sadder picture of human frailty and misery. When young, theological secretary to Cardinal Barberini, from whose house he was expelled; next a captain of freebooters in Calabria, he came from prison to teach medicine at Pisa. In 1667 he quitted Tuscany with an indifferent reputation for morals, as Targioni observes, (i. 227) and came to Rome, where, instead of being seized by the Inquisition and stretched on the rack, he was engaged to attend, in quality of physician, Don Tommaso Rospigliosi, nephew of Clement IX. (*Grandi, Risposta apolog.* p. 176.) Tiraboschi informs us that he had easy access to several pontiffs: (*Storia Letter.* ed. Rom. viii., p. 210) and, according to Targioni, he held a situation in the palace. During all this time we have no traces of any animosity against him for having been a member of the Cimento, or a disciple of Galileo. After the death of Innocent XI, he was discovered to be deeply concerned in a society of a highly immoral character, and was imprisoned. While led to examination a second time, he slipped from his guards, threw himself headlong from an open window, and died in three hours. Romolini speaks severely of the evil life and death of Oliva, and quotes Marini to the same effect, and for the narrative we have given. (*Ragionamento sulla Satira*, in *Mencini's Satire*, p. 84.) As to any torture, it is a

pure invention of the recreant Italian whose essay we are examining.

Two charges yet remain, and we will handle them more lightly. And first, what truth is there in the story of Galileo's manuscripts being destroyed? It had indeed been asserted, long ago, that on the death of Father Renieri, who possessed Galileo's papers, his study was visited, and all his papers, as well as that philosopher's, seized; and the writer gives it *as a report*, that this was done by the inquisitor. (*Lett. ined.* i. 74.) But then all this must have happened, if it ever did, in 1648, nearly *ten years before the foundation of the Academy*, and consequently can have nothing to do with any papal stipulations about its suppression. The account, moreover, must be inaccurate, as Renieri's own papers served Targioni for his history, consequently cannot have been destroyed; and it is certain that he did not possess all Galileo's. Some of these are said to have been burnt by his nephew, in a fit of scrupulous alarm about his uncle's orthodoxy. But the essayist informs us that other writings of the Florentine philosopher were "turned to the vilest purposes." We suppose he alludes to the following circumstance:—Many of Galileo's manuscripts were placed in the hands of Viviani, who had undertaken a magnificent edition of his works, and was much encouraged in the project by Cardinal Leopold. (*Grandi*, p. 66.) Upon his death they came into the possession of the Abate Panzanini, and, upon the decease of the latter in 1737, were so far neglected, that a servant visited them from time to time, and carried away many of them

—————"In vicum vendentem thus et odores,
Et piper, et quidquid chartis amicitur ineptis."

A certain Cioci, celebrated for his savoury wares, having been favoured among others with a parcel, and having used some for wrapping up his sausages, which enjoyed a great reputation, the discovery was made, and the remnant reserved from destruction. (*Targioni*, i. 124.) This, unfortunately, has been the fate of too many valuable papers. Within these two years, we have heard that the Barberini library at Rome has been plundered precisely in the same manner of important documents, which were discovered by the very same means. We ourselves are sufferers in a similar way; as are several of our friends, whose fires have been kindled for successive months with old records, carefully laid up, but considered, by the sagacity of servants, as put by for their especial use, in the process of domestic calefaction. Prejudice must have run high in our author's mind, to make him connect this sacrilegious larceny, perpetrated by a

valet and a cheesemonger, seventy years after the dissolution of the Academy, with this dissolution, and lay it, moreover, to the score of Popes, long before gathered to their fathers. The papers belonging to the Academy remained safe in possession of the Segni family, having been left them by the Senator Alexander Segni, first Secretary of the Academy.

Secondly, as to the destruction of the philosophical apparatus, we beg to observe that it is as true as the remainder of the narrative. It would, indeed, have been matter of small surprise if even all the instruments had been dispersed, and gradually lost or destroyed, after the society which used them had been dissolved. But this was not the case. The collection remained where Cardinal Leopold had always kept it, till Florence became subject to the Emperor. It was then deposited in the house of the imperial machinist Vayringe; after whose death, a part was sent to Vienna by order of Francis I, the greater part were placed in two rooms adjoining the library of the Pitti Palace, where Targioni saw them. Some also were preserved, in his time, in the mathematical room, as it was called, of the Ducal Gallery. But what makes this accusation still more intolerable is, that in 1829, the Cavalier Antinori, director of the Museum, discovered a chest in which were several instruments, and among them a number of thermometers with a scale of 50°, which form the subject of the accuser's essay. (*Antologia di Firenze*, Oct. 1830, p. 141.) There is no more truth, therefore, in the broken instruments than in Oliva's broken bones; the whole account is a disgraceful perversion of facts, for the purpose of holding up Rome to execration, as the persecutor of scientific studies.

We have had sufficient experience of the frauds published in our own country, for the same purpose, not to have used our humble endeavours to prevent this being added to the stock in trade of our controversial travellers. It would make a pretty appendix to Galileo's history. We doubt not but it would be greatly relished in Exeter Hall, where every atrocity is fondly credited which can inspire a nursery horror of the Pope. We verily believe that if the story were served up with some additional contemporary relish—as for example, that the present Pope had renewed the war against science, and had sent forth an army of Jesuits through his dominions, with orders to spike every telescope, and to dismantle every voltaic battery, the whole, tail and all, would be swallowed by the gaping mouths of the audience in that precious conventicle.

We mentioned, at the beginning of this article, the Roman academy of the *Lincei*, as devoted to the same purposes as the *Cimento*; in fact, it was its model, and hardly deserves less fame. Yet it has been comparatively overlooked. On the pre-

sent occasion, however, it is forcibly recalled to our minds, not merely by the resemblance we pointed out between it and its more celebrated successor, but still more by its giving a proof that the Holy See felt no jealousy of such institutions. For, when we see an academy consisting of a few philosophers, united under the patronage of a prince, for the ardent pursuit of the same studies as the Florentine, counting, which the other never did, Galileo himself among its members, yet not only unmo-
lested, but patronized by the Pope and his family, we can hardly conceive it possible that Rome should ever have felt a hatred against science which could go so far to display itself.

But, to our minds, there is a deeper interest attached to the brief annals of this Roman academy. They are interwoven with the amiable, virtuous, and heroic character of its youthful founder, so as to possess all the stirring interest of a romance. They display, beyond almost anything else we ever read, the purity of purpose, the chastity of mind, the nobleness of soul, which a devotedness to the study of nature, when sanctified by religion, can bestow. They exhibit all the meek courage of the martyrs, in the humbler, but dearer, sphere of domestic persecution. We repeat it, the history of this academy, with its Prince Federico Cesi for the hero, would present ample materials for a romance, full of incident and spirit, and rich in the most varied characters.

Federico Cesi, son of the Duke of Acquasparta, was born in 1585. In 1603, when eighteen years of age, he laid the foundation of his Academy, being already in correspondence with some of the first philosophers of the age. His first companion in his plan was Francesco Stelluti, who possessed an equal ardour for science, morals equally pure, and a piety equally fervent. Having heard of John Eckius, or Reckius, a Hollander practising medicine in the little town of Scandriglia, in Sabina, a man deeply versed in every branch of philosophy, they invited him to settle in Rome, attached to the Cesi family. Finding the want of order and system in their studies, they arranged the plan of an academy, and, to complete it, added to their number Anastasio de Filiis, a young nobleman of Terni, who had a particular turn for mechanics; and, being a relation of the family, lived in their house. On the 17th of August, 1603, the Academy was inaugurated by its young *Prince*, as he was henceforth called. Its meetings were to be quite private; and their researches were to embrace every branch of natural and moral philosophy. By the 22d of October they had finished the construction of a great planisphere, on which were drawn the ancient and modern systems of astronomy. They met three times a week, and had five lectures at each meeting; and the subjects

treated show how active each member must have been in his pursuits. Persecution, however, soon disturbed their tranquillity. The morals of the academicians were irreproachable; and their statutes prescribed virtue as the first duty. Among the numerous dependents of the Duke were many who, instigated by jealousy or worse motives, poisoned his ear, and filled him with suspicions against his son. He made every effort to separate him from his companions, and to wean him from his studies, but in vain. With his mother, a woman of sincere piety, and who, to the end, was kind and affectionate to him, they endeavoured to prevail, by insinuations against his moral conduct; and at length succeeded so far as to render her uneasy in his regard. On Christmas Day, when the very existence of the Academy seemed precarious, the Prince assembled it, and, after a touching speech, invested each member with a gold chain. They agreed to a new code of laws, among which was one that every meeting should be opened by prayer. St. John the Evangelist was chosen patron of the Academy; and, forthwith proceeding to his church, they implored his intercession in their difficulties.

But the Duke was a man of haughty, overbearing disposition, dark in his plots, and inexorable in his resentments. To such an excess did he carry his enmity, that his son was obliged to fly from his house, and was pursued by him with an armed band. Stelluti was compelled to return to Faburiano, and De Filiis to Terni, surrounded by emissaries, and threatened by the bravoës of the stern old lord. Yet, when so dispersed, they continued to correspond, and even to meet in the country, at the risk of life. Eckius, obliged also to conceal himself, had his apartment broken open by the Duke's orders, his furniture demolished, and the collections and instruments destroyed. But the wily tyrant wove around him a darker mesh. He affected kindness and respect towards him; and, having drawn from him the names of his sworn enemies, suborned them to make the vilest accusations against him before the ecclesiastical authorities. His life was threatened, on Holy Thursday, by an assassin; and, after having lain concealed and almost starved, in young Cesi's apartment, for many days, with sentinels at every door, he was obliged to surrender at discretion, and was escorted by a band of hired ruffians to Holland. On his way, he wrote his observations on natural history, with admirable drawings on the margin, which he sent to Rome. They were preserved, with the diary and other papers of the Academy, in the Albani Library, till the French invasion. His guards left him without money at Turin; but he proceeded to Holland, and thence to England and Scotland, on which he likewise wrote his observations. Cesi retired to Naples, where he still pursued

his studies. Eckius returned to Rome in 1606, as appears from a letter written by him to the celebrated Kepler; but new persecutions obliged him again to fly, till 1614, when, for the last time, he returned to the eternal city.

The annals of the Society are silent till 1609; a year remarkable in the history of science for the invention of the telescope. The news of the accidental discovery at Middelburg, which suggested the idea of that invaluable instrument to Galileo, reached Italy in the spring of that year; and we have a letter of Della Porta at Naples, to Cesi, dated August 28, in which he gives a drawing of a telescope, with a reference, for its principles, to his work on Optics, published in 1589. When we consider that Galileo did not exhibit his in Rome till 1611, it will seem probable that Della Porta was guided by his own sagacity to divine the nature of the new invention. One thing, however, the historian of this Academy considers pretty certain; that the names "telescope" and "microscope" were first devised by Federico Cesi. When Galileo came to Rome, he became a member of the Academy, at whose expense some of his works were printed. Indeed, by the year 1612, it had extended its reputation very far, and undertaken the publication of several works, among the rest, the observations of Hernandez on the natural history of New Spain, with notes by the Academy, and had formed a plan for branch societies, with a college at Naples. The work of Hernandez did not, however, appear till 1651 (2 vols. fol.); and it has prefixed a brief, dated 1627, of Pope Urban VIII, the very pope under whom Galileo was condemned, in praise of the Academy. To the same pope, Cesi dedicated his microscopic observations on the bee; and his nephew Cardinal Barberini entered his name among the members of the Academy.

But, in the mean time, new domestic troubles had gradually withdrawn Cesi from his previous undivided attention to the interests of his society. He had married; and, in addition to the cares of his own household, had to undertake the management of his father's property; for the old nobleman, extravagant as he was imperious, had fallen into considerable embarrassment; and, reserving an annuity, made over his estates to his son, who engaged to pay all creditors. Cesi was obliged to reside upon the estate of Acquasparta, upwards of a hundred miles from Rome; and, at the same time, his father's waywardness and tyranny wore out his spirits, and undermined his constitution. The Duke died on the 24th of June, 1630; and, on the 2d of August, his son followed him to the grave, at the age of forty-five. He seems to have been the idol of all that knew him. His portrait exhibits a mild, and thoughtful, and noble

countenance; and every record proves that, while, in moments of danger and difficulty, he could display the greatest courage and dignity, yet, when contending with the capricious tyranny of his father, he never, in word or act, transgressed the duty of an obedient son. He was well versed in every class of literature; seems to have been a proficient in Arabic; and, when Cardinal Bellarmine consulted him upon some points of natural history, his answer, though written in the country, contained so much learned discussion upon the doctrine of the fathers, whose passages he quoted on the subject, that the eminent theologian affectionately chid him for such an unnecessary display of learning. This correspondence is given by Scheiner in his *Rosa Ursina*. Cesi was one of the first to make accurate observations on fossil woods, and to discover the system of propagation of ferns. Brown has accomplished what the Lincei were anxious to do, to commemorate his name in science by conferring it on some plant. His class of *Cæsia*, in Australian botany, is called after him.

After Cesi's death, the Academy languished on for twenty years, when it became extinct. His death, indeed, was so sudden, that he did not make a will; and thus his museum, with its curious collections and instruments, became the property of his family. Bianchi, who wrote a history of the Academy, endeavoured to revive it, but failed.* At the beginning of this century, it was renewed. Pope Leo XII gave it apartments in the Capitol, and built for it there an observatory, now under the direction of its president, Scarpellioni. Its apparatus is very complete; and we have now lying before us an able paper lately read in it by the learned Father Pianciani, containing some new experiments and results upon electro-magnetism. The present pope pays an annual visit to this establishment.

We might have added to this sketch the history of other scientific academies, as that of Bologna, which succeeded the Cimento, and reached its glory under Morgagni, for it never experienced anything but countenance and protection from the sovereign pontiffs; but what we have written is sufficient for our purpose, which was to disprove the assertions of Libri, and at the same time, to show the slight grounds of plausibility on which they rest.

* For our account of the Lincei we are indebted to Prince Odescalchi's work upon the subject, 4to. Rome, 1806.

For a correct account of the state of natural philosophy in the middle ages, and an exposure of many erroneous opinions of modern writers as to the supposed hostility of the Church to scientific pursuits, see Cap. VII, VIII, and IX, of Mr. Digby's admirable *Age of Faith*, Book VIII, recently published. We hope in a future number to draw the attention of our readers to the writings of this very distinguished author. The 8th Book, inasmuch as it is more practical, exceeds its predecessors in merit.

ART. VIII.—*Christian Political Economy ; or, an Examination into the Causes of Pauperism as it exists in France and Europe, and of the Means of Relieving and Preventing it.* By the Viscount Villeneuve Bargimont, Prefect of the North, formerly Counsellor of State, Deputy, &c. 3 vols. Paris. 1834.

THE progress of industry, the continually increasing activity of manufactories, and the more and more extensive application of the principles of science to all the useful arts, are facts which the detractors of the times we live in cannot dispute. If Great Britain was the first to give the signal for this universal activity, if she still leaves all other nations behind her in the career which she threw open to them, it is not the less true that the space which separated her from her rivals is sensibly diminished. Not only have the United States, with all the energetic pertinacity that distinguishes the inhabitants of the mother country, raised numerous manufactories under the protection of their liberal institutions, and that even before the increase of population could suffice for the purposes of agriculture ; but nations bending under the yoke of despotism, the Austrians, and even the Russians, are making progress in the amelioration of the useful arts,—and ere long, perhaps, Sheffield may have to contest with the workmen of Toul for her monopoly in the markets of Persia. France, Belgium, and Prussia, on their part, are displaying unaccustomed activity ; and their manufactories, multiplied and improved as they have been since 1815, will perhaps receive in the course of a few years an assistance from the railroads now projecting upon the continent, the consequences of which we can neither foresee nor calculate. Without giving way to the enthusiasm of some modern Utopians, if we examine, however coolly, this concourse of powers, inert half a century ago, and now employed in the production of all that is necessary, of all that is merely agreeable to the human race,—if we reflect that these powers continually gain strength, and are directed by knowledge, which is itself increasing,—it is difficult not to believe in the approach of an earthly millennium, during which poverty shall be banished from the earth and misery unknown. Such, at least, would be the conclusion we should come to, could we be ignorant, that at the side, under the very shadow, of those gigantic establishments which the genius of industry has raised, pauperism has established her dwelling. There is no doubt that there are every where men, whose idleness or misery levies a tax upon the superfluities of their fellow-creatures ; but these beings whom vice or misfortune has degraded, are no where

numerous enough to become an intolerable burden, or to compromise the future peace of nations, except in the countries to which industry has carried all her riches, and which have attained the highest degree of prosperity. There would even seem to be an indissoluble connexion between wealth and pauperism,—they put forth together their power of increase, and faithfully divide the conquests which they make. Thus, in Great Britain, so far exceeding other nations in the extent of her commerce, and the skill and perseverance of her workmen, there is a greater number of individuals supported by public charity than can be found in any other country. Of all her rivals, France approaches her the nearest; and, accordingly, next to herself, the largest proportion of poor is to be found in the manufacturing districts of that country. Of this we shall find abundant proofs in the remarkable work we are about to analyze.

It would be an evident absurdity to suppose, that pauperism and industry can be connected in such a way, as that the most enterprising and laborious people should of necessity be those who include the greatest number of persons unable to support themselves by the work of their hands. Manufactories, and the commerce they supply, create an immense demand for workmanship, and have consequently a most favourable effect upon the price of wages, and the welfare of all who prefer the comfort of independence to the shameful idleness of parish support. None can be less disposed than we are to believe that the accumulation of our circulating capital, and the excellence and multiplicity of our machines, can tend to promote or aggravate the distress of the lower classes,—a distress which, although partial in England, is indisputable, and could not be much increased without endangering her tranquillity. Unhappy Ireland is a living proof of the utility, nay more, of the necessity of commercial industry. If her inhabitants, in spite of the fecundity of their soil, are now an object of pity to those who, in the natural course of things, should have beheld them with envy,—it is because, reduced almost entirely to the cultivation of the earth, and deprived of the resources they would find in more abundant capital, and in manufactories, in proportion to the number of hands not required by agriculture, they find nothing to employ the time left at their disposal by their present occupation. To pacify Ireland would be to give her what she requires,—by offering to English capitalists a market incalculably more advantageous than the mines of Mexico. The redress of all her grievances will certainly have an immense political effect, by adding to the legal bond that unites the two islands, the closer union of sincere and reciprocal affection. But the concessions already obtained for

Ireland, or those she is still seeking, are, as respects the welfare of her peasants, only so many means of opening a more extensive market to their labour. But however great the advantage of industry, whether for the workman himself or the country which he inhabits, the progress of pauperism in the wealthiest nations is not the less a fact, and a phenomenon which deserved and obtained the most serious consideration. As England was the first to perceive this deplorable anomaly, so our economists were the first to inquire into the causes of it. The late Mr. Malthus owes much of his celebrity to his well-known and justly admired essay on the principle of population. According to this writer, population, when it is unchecked by external circumstances, but obeys its natural tendencies, is multiplied in a geometrical proportion,—and as, when all land is brought into cultivation which is capable of it, food can only increase in arithmetical ratio, it follows, as is unanswerably demonstrated, that at the end of a certain number of years, in any country whatever, if it has been well and happily governed, and has not been ravaged by periodical scourges, the number of inhabitants will arrive at that point when the produce of the earth will be insufficient to sustain them. This theory, broached as it was at a time when the farmers were realizing enormous profits by the rise in the price of corn, became immediately popular: its success was the more certain, because those who most violently attacked it had no reasonable objection to oppose to it. If we suppose a nation never visited by plagues, where the fields are habitually fertile, and which is constantly directed by a wise administration in the paths of prosperity, we shall easily discover, that in time this nation will multiply until its harvests, however skilful its agriculturists, will no longer suffice for the necessities of an innumerable population: and what is true of one people is true of all, if they all and always enjoy the advantages we have enumerated. Thus, as is so forcibly stated by the learned Mr. Malthus, we can only conceive two possible remedies for such a frightful consequence of *universal and continual happiness*,—the one which should precede and prevent it, the other which should accompany and diminish its terrible effects. The first is the moral check, which would prevent improvident marriages; the second is the misery consequent upon these marriages when they become too numerous, which misery, by destroying a part of the children, would leave a sufficiency for the rest, at least, for the purposes of existence. As Mr. Malthus's system offered a plausible explanation of the increase of pauperism, it was eagerly adopted by the greater number of political economists, who were unable either to deny the existence of the evil or to

propose a remedy. By the writings of many of them, one might be tempted to believe, that it was to punish Adam for the fault he had not yet committed, that God imposed on him the command to increase and multiply. Economists of both sexes combined their efforts in this crusade against marriage, — and certainly if the propagation of our species could be stopped by subtlety and talent, the works of Miss Martineau would entitle her to the especial gratitude of that posterity—whose existence she would have prevented. But with all this, there is something so terrible in a theory which seems in its practical effects to revive Manicheism, and all its horror of conjugal union, that violent opposition to it might be expected; and accordingly a keen controversy began upon the subject: and no one on either part thought of considering whether or not this superabundance of population so much disputed about, did really exist. Yet this was the point at which they should have commenced; for the doctrines of the *Essay on Population* may be true in this sense, that in certain given circumstances, the human race will not find food enough upon the earth to support it—or, to go farther, space enough to move about in—without its being therefore necessary to admit that wherever there are poor, the cause of their misery is the too great number of inhabitants. If we are not mistaken, the disputants followed too closely the example of the learned men of the sixteenth century, who expended so much ink in proving on the one side, that men might be born with teeth of gold, and on the other, that such a phenomenon was impossible; they would have done better, in the first place, to open the mouth of the child who occasioned the dispute, and at once ascertain the fact. The superabundance of the population that eat must not be confounded with the superabundance of the population that work,—and it is evident that the Malthusian theory applies only to the first. Now we deny most absolutely that there is in Europe one single country, which, with the land already under cultivation, and by the assistance of the means of traffic which it derives from its industry, might not subsist a more numerous population than that which it now contains. Let us take the United Kingdom as an example; are not landlords and farmers complaining of the low price of corn? have not cultivated fields to a considerable extent been thrown into pasturage as a more profitable employment? These are striking proofs that the demand for food is not greater than the supply; if we required others, we should find them in the modifications that have been made in the corn laws. Is it credible that the quantity of foreign corn admitted for home consumption should not be more than 500,000 quarters, if there were really such a disproportion.

between our harvests and our wants? Restore to the plough a part of the lands which it tilled before its labours were circumscribed by the low price of grain, and instead of importing the produce of foreign agriculture, we shall be able to export the produce of our own. It may perhaps be said, that the supply of food is only more extensive than the demand, because the lower classes, especially in Ireland, are condemned to an almost perpetual fast; and that for England in particular, she receives yearly from the sister island provisions to the value of £10,000,000 sterling: but Holland, at the best period of her prosperity, was far from producing corn enough for her consumption,—yet no Dutch Malthus at that time thought of blaming Providence for the fertility of his countrywomen. The profits of industry and of commerce compensated for the insufficiency of agriculture; and who will dare to affirm that in the nineteenth century, England, the richest of all nations, could not find in the same means the same resources? If the wages of our workmen were high enough to enable all without exception to buy all the food they could require, we should import a larger quantity of food and a smaller of silks and trinkets,—nor should we sow an additional acre of land, for prices would remain stationary. If then there is distress in the country—if pauperism spreads like a contagious distemper—it is not owing to that sort of superabundance which disturbed the imagination of Mr. Malthus. We are not in the situation of a ship's crew put upon an allowance of food because their stock of provisions is on the eve of failing, and they know not where nor when they will be able to replenish it. Whoever has money wherewith to pay for his daily bread, is far more secure of obtaining it than is the farmer that he shall receive a remunerating price. Setting aside the recourse we might have to foreign markets, our ordinary harvests are sufficient, since the quantity of corn that we import does not amount to the fortieth part of our consumption; and consequently if the inhabitants of the country have greatly multiplied, the produce of the earth has increased in a like proportion. Indeed we do not hesitate to affirm, that the progress of agriculture has surpassed that of population, since if they had advanced at an equal rate, the money value of grain would have risen much more than it has done within the last fifty years, in consequence of the prodigious increase of our circulating medium. The existence of a superabundant population, when compared with the quantity of provisions we can command, is as great a fallacy as ever gained credit among mankind; but there is another redundancy, the redundancy of labour, which cannot be so easily denied, and to which must be ascribed, with the gradual impoverishment of the lower orders,

every mischief growing out of their present distress. Of all marketable commodities, that which is least sure of a demand, most variable in its price, and which makes to the producer the most unfavourable return, is unquestionably manual labour,—and yet, thanks to the decay of religious feeling, and to the desire for the comforts of life which is now so generally diffused, the workman has contracted habits and acquired tastes which were formerly unknown to him. And thus he is doubly a sufferer, since his condition is worse, and his anxiety for its improvement greater. This is the wound which is so deeply seated in commercial countries, and which, if not healed, must in the end prove mortal. It should therefore be the constant aim of political economists to discover some means by which the wages of labour may be brought up to the proper level. No doubt a reduction in the number of labourers would have, in this respect, a sensible effect; but it is really making a jest of our credulity to maintain that we can expect this reduction from the intelligence of the lower classes, without other moral check than the fear of bringing into the world children, whose condition would be burdensome to themselves and their parents. Protestants, who inveigh so violently against the celibacy of our priests and religious orders, would scarcely dare to represent marriage, to their workmen, as a thing forbidden them by the word of God. It would be a something quite too absurd that they should insist upon giving wives to their ministers at the expense of their labourers,—and however able they may be in expounding the Holy Scriptures, we do not think they will find in them a syllable to condemn improvident marriages. We, Catholics, so long accused of binding our clergy to a duty which is contrary to nature, do not go so far as this,—and, consequently, neither Protestants nor Catholics can avail themselves of any religious tenet in the advice given to the lower orders; at best that advice is but a caution, founded entirely upon temporal considerations. We undertake to persuade them, that, in satisfying the strongest of human passions, under its most legitimate form, in taking a helpmate, they will rather add to than alleviate their sufferings. This would indeed be the fact, if there could be any comparison drawn between the happiness promised by the marriage state and the physical wants which it creates for the poor man; or if those wants were as terrifying to his mind as they appear to ours. But the labourer whose morals are untainted, has a heart to feel as well as any lord, and less than the wealthiest lord does he dread the incumbrance of a numerous issue. A peer of the realm may, indeed, look with some terror at the prospect of a large family, because unless he succeeds in

quartering them upon the public purse, the junior branches can only bud and blossom at the expense of the elder scion. The humble mechanic is so far better off: he has no younger sons to support in the world,—they are all *first born*, since each of them is entitled to the whole of their parent's estate,—his industrious habits, his sinewy frame, and health unsubdued by the blandishments of wealth and indolence.

It therefore would be folly, however miserable his fate may be, to ask him to abstain from marriage, for the love of beings who have yet no existence, and for the fear of bringing them into a state to which he himself is resigned. It would be more logical, if the belief in a future existence did not intervene, to preach to him the advantages of suicide; and, indeed, if the life that he leads appears to him insupportable, why does he not kill himself; but if he believes that it is preferable to death, why should he hesitate to become the father of labourers, who, after all, will be no worse off than himself? There is a certain school of atheistical politicians, whose declamations against imprudent marriages have a direct tendency to encourage the greatest of all crimes. For if there is virtue in not assisting to increase the supply of labour by the propagation of the species, there must be virtue in a man's diminishing the stock by throwing himself into the water: happily the fear of overstocking the market, which regulates the price of labour, has as little power to add one new name to the list of suicides, as to erase one from that of husbands.

If the fate reserved for the children that may be borne of him, cannot prevent the marriage of the labourer, will he shun the burden of a young family for his own sake, from the fear of being overpowered by it? No doubt this perspective is a real check upon a young man whose personal situation would be made much worse by the necessity of providing for a young family; but then his situation must be one which is capable of becoming worse; that is to say, he must be in possession of some comforts which he must give up when he gives up celibacy. If, like the Irish peasant, he has reached the last pitch of human misery, what has he to fear? Downright starvation seldom occurs: there is such a thing as charity in the land; and he can hardly apprehend that the meagre pittance he subsists upon himself will not be afforded to his little ones by some friendly neighbour; nay, by exciting sympathy, they will obtain a relief which may, perhaps, extend to himself; and, if he reside within the pale of a poor law system, they will invest him with a legal claim to public assistance. Assuredly, when the conjugal tie is the only sort of happiness the poor man can hope to know in

this world, he will not easily be persuaded to renounce it; unless, indeed, the beginning of the attempt is to corrupt his morals; but in that case, celibacy will become alarmingly fruitful, and natural children will fill up the place of those who are not born in wedlock. Thus, in France, in England, and, wherever religious faith is weakened, the number of marriages diminishes, but that of labourers does not the less increase. It must be owned, that our present social organization contributes greatly to increase, if not the number of marriages, at any rate that of births. At all times, the greater part of mechanics have lived at their own expense, receiving from their employers the wages agreed upon. The unmarried artizan, thus placed, is almost irresistibly led to get married, or to lead an immoral life; but it was otherwise with the agricultural labourers, who were mostly supported by the farmers who employed them, and lived under the same roofs; and in this case celibacy was almost always the implied condition upon which they kept places which they were not willing to lose. At present a different system prevails very generally; and the agricultural labourer, placed in the same situation as the mechanic, and in possession of equal independence, is exposed to as great temptations. Connexions, lawful or unlawful, have therefore wonderfully increased; at the same time our system of manufacturing steps in to offer a real premium for the multiplication of young generations. Wages are now given to children, however young. How is it possible, then, that the workman can fear to have too many children in those districts where factories flourish, so long, at least, as they do flourish? All the reasonings of Mr. Malthus, and of all his disciples, can never counterbalance the terrible fact of wages earned by infants. Imprudent marriages have multiplied wherever this fact exists; above all, when the inducement thus held out is strengthened by a legal provision made for the destitute. The employment of women and children at labours which formerly required the address and the strength of adults of the other sex, has contributed not only to multiply marriages, but to increase the quantity of labour thrown into the market. Out of a million of human beings, there are now (we are speaking of manufacturing districts) many more labourers than before the introduction of machinery. Since the man who has attained to adolescence is scarcely preferred to the woman or the child, and the task of the workman has become merely an exertion of incessant watchfulness; for the machines lend their immense power, their incomparable address, to the weakest and least intelligent hand; and individual ability thus neutralized, the work of the father of the family is placed upon a par with that

of his children. They come together into the market; and we cannot be surprised if the supply exceeds the demand. It is true that all work; but if the work of all together obtains no higher amount of remuneration—if the wage of the father is diminished by what his children receive—we are compelled to acknowledge that, in this respect, the very perfection of machinery leads to some danger. By it we have added to the number of workmen, without increasing the number of consumers; and thus is explained in part why the distress of the lower orders has its source not in the rise in the price of food, but in the reduction of wages. It is well known, however, that England is not the only civilized country where this reduction has taken place, and has been accompanied by indications the most alarming for the public tranquillity. Our continental neighbours are not, in this respect, better off than ourselves; perhaps they have more right than we to complain, for they have made greater efforts to falsify the words of our Lord,—“The poor you shall have always with you.” Those religious reformers who, during three centuries, accused Catholicism of being the natural adversary of social principles, and of all systems which were favourable to the prosperity of a people, or the development of their liberty, contented themselves with dividing amongst the nobility, or giving to a married clergy, the wealth which had belonged to a priesthood living in celibacy. The French reformers proceeded differently: acting for the people, they distributed *amongst the people* not only all ecclesiastical estates, but also those of the principal families; and the law of succession was altered in such a manner as seemed to hold out to the inhabitants of that country the enjoyment, at no distant date, of *all the benefits* of a real agrarian law; for already the number of landed proprietors who pay a land tax of less than five francs, amounts to upwards of four millions. Yet, in spite of the democratic tendency of the legislation, and of the administration in France, the lower orders are as numerous, and seem likely soon to be as miserable, as in those countries where they are most to be pitied. That this should be the result of so many confiscations, and of so many measures intended expressly for improving the condition of the working classes, might well astonish those who had so loudly applauded the former, and so eagerly sought for the latter; and their surprise was so much the greater, and the more natural, because the distress which now exists in France was unknown before 1815; that is to say, before, in imitation of our example, she had entered the career of commerce upon the grandest scale. If the memory of Napoleon is still so popular amongst those who suffered the first and the

most severely from his despotism, it is because, during his reign, wages were extremely high; and the workmen, in consequence, were far happier than they have been since. It is true that this prosperity cost dear; for it was the result of the conscription, by which the supply of labour was diminished in a much greater proportion than the calamities of Europe had lessened the demand. The tax of blood levied by the conqueror upon all the families of France realized the Utopia of our economists; and it is worthy of remark, that peace with all the nations of the world, and the immense field which it threw open, within and without, to the industry of the French, has not been able to keep wages at their imperial level; because the demand for labour thus created could by no means keep pace with the supply of labour which resulted immediately from the abolition of a system of recruiting that spared but a small minority of young men, and restored but a small minority of those whom it carried away. We have here a striking proof that the increase of manufactories, and the apparent, and even real prosperity of a great country, are not incompatible with the ruin of the labouring classes. When the higher classes grew rich, and wages were reduced, the French economists were more than ever embarrassed to find an explanation of this deplorable phenomenon. According to Say and his immediate followers, the glut of manufactured produce which so frequently took place, and the almost periodical suspensions of the labours of the mechanics, were occasioned by there being still not a sufficiency produced. According to Sismondi and many others, the increase of population was the real cause of a distress which could no longer be disputed. All demanded fresh markets; and, as the Bourbons failed to discover any, and as these writers were, for the most part, of the protestant or anti-catholic school, they attacked the religion of the Bourbons, and carried their absurdity so far as to accuse the priests, above all the Jesuits, of the disasters of French commerce.

A new school then arose, in the St. Simonians, who were political economists before they became a religious sect. They took up the question further back, in the connexion between the master and the workman; and they maintained that, in the present constitution of society, the latter is inevitably a victim to the rapacity of his employer; and that thus, in order to procure for the working classes a tolerable existence, a complete revolution was necessary, in the first place in property, and in the second, in the laws by which the possession and the enjoyment of it are regulated. With higher views, and more cultivated intelligence, the St. Simonians arrived at the same practical

results as the *Owenites*; and if their religious reveries are now forgotten, it is not so with their theories upon property, and the distribution of the social revenue, which have sunk deep into the minds of the people, and greatly weakened their respect for the right of the rich man to the full possession and free disposal of his fortune. We do not hesitate to affirm, that even among the higher classes, the opinion which is most generally received is, that society alone possesses, and that each individual proprietor holds from her, and during her good pleasure, all the rights with which he is invested. The Catholics, and perhaps they alone, reject, at this time, a principle which would imply (at least in the abstract) that the governors of society possess a power of removing property, and disposing of it at their pleasure. At length came the revolution of July, and with it a government which made war upon the Jesuits, tore the cross from the churches, and could hardly be suspected of being priest-ridden. But the rate of wages continued to decline; and, in spite of the triumph of the liberal party, in spite of seven years of extraordinary abundance, the French workmen, far from entering upon the Eden of which they believed they had forced the gates in 1830, behold the comforts they had formerly enjoyed decreasing day by day. There is no recent traveller in France, who has mixed with the people, who has not observed how greatly less violent are the prejudices of the working-classes against the clergy; how completely the French priests have ceased to be considered as the natural allies of the administration. The opposition can no longer make them responsible for the existing distress; the lower orders no longer accuse them of their sufferings. Catholicism is at length distinct from the discussions concerning wages, and has found in this new position a thousand times greater advantages than it could have received from the favour of the elder branch. Experience had proved that the Catholic religion, so far at least as court favour and court influence were concerned, had nothing to do with the glut either of produce or of labour; and then arose a new school of political economists. Catholic in its faith, and catholic in its manner of conceiving science, this school, little known in England, begins to develope its principles in France; and its existence is the necessary consequence of the entire contradiction which facts have given to the doctrines and to the promises of protestantism and of philosophy. It was natural that Catholics, who had so long heard religious celibacy denounced as anti-social by the enemies of their creed, should begin, upon reading the essay of Malthus, to enquire whether this institution had not been specially provided to preserve society from the tremen-

dous evil of a redundant population, and whether it does not constitute the only moral check that can be made practically available. It was natural, also, that they should enquire whether the idleness of the workhouse is not a heavier expense to a country, and does not deprive it of a greater number of hands than the charity of convents, which had been despoiled of their wealth under the pretext that they offered a premium to laziness. Above all, it was natural that, at the cries of distress they heard arising on all sides from the wealthiest nations, they should ask each other whether the obvious derangement of the social machine, a derangement loudly proclaimed by philosophy and protestantism, although neither the one nor the other could indicate their cause, did not arise from the decay of the faith, and neglect of the precepts, of catholicism. Smith does not admit genius or science to come into the enumeration of riches. His disciples, Ricardo, M'Culloch, and Senior, amongst us, Say and Storch upon the continent, have acknowledged that the illustrious author of the *Essay on the Wealth of Nations* was deceived. The Catholic school now goes beyond them, and affirms, that the moral virtues, probity, chastity, and temperance, do as truly come into the catalogue of national riches as genius and science. —They may be wrong, and some of our readers will probably smile at their simplicity; for our parts, however, we can hardly refrain from admitting with them, that the girl who by her chastity exempts the parish from the burthen of maintaining an illegitimate child, is as useful a being as the producer of the thread wherewith the shirt of that child would have been sewn.

But, like all things in their beginning, the Catholic school has as yet not got beyond the first rudiments of its theories; and up to this time has done little besides pointing out the fatal consequences, that, with or without reason, it attributed to the prevailing doctrines, and seeking out means to ameliorate the fate of those poor who are unable to work or to live on the fruits of their labour. The most distinguished writer of this school is certainly the Viscount de Villeneuve Bargemont; and it is but just to say, that he has given proof, in his book entitled *Christian Political Economy*, of an immense knowledge of the practical part of his subject; and no one can have had greater advantages than he has in collecting the materials necessary for such a work. Auditor of the council of state under Napoleon, and sub-prefect at Zuricksee in Holland, promoted in 1812 to the prefecture of the mouths of the Ebro in Spain, prefect in 1815 of the department of Farn and Garonne in France, and afterwards successively of the departments of the Charente, of the Meurthe and of the Lower Loire, he was councillor of state and prefect of the department of the north—that is to say, of the most com-

mercial department in his country—when the revolution of July drove him from the administration. In possession of an independent fortune, and enjoying the most honourable reputation, he now devotes his leisure to the study of political economy; and the practical knowledge he has obtained in the discharge of his official duties, give a merit to his book which is wanting in most that are written on this subject.

In the beginning of his administrative career, M. de Villeneuve adopted the doctrines of Smith and of Say, the only political economists with whom he was as yet acquainted; but the works of Malthus afterwards shook all his preconceived ideas. In the first instance, as a patriot and a public functionary, he had wished to see in France an unlimited development of the factory system: afterwards he was led to suspect, that the extension of manufactories, by the indefinite multiplication of population, must, as a necessary consequence, tend to increase pauperism to an equal extent. This opinion, which was partly adopted during his administration of the agricultural provinces, gained strength as he studied more attentively the condition of the poorer classes; and became a certainty when the richest department of France, that which contains nearly half of its spinning factories, had been confided to his care. We give his own words on this subject:—

“It has been my fate to exercise administrative functions successively in each of the different parts of the kingdom; and at the beginning of 1828 I was promoted to the prefecture of the department of the north. I deeply regretted Brittany; but my regret was lessened by the hope that I should find in a department, which is known to have made greater progress than any other in agriculture, civilization, and industry, an enlightened, rich, and happy population, amongst whom misery, if not unknown, would at least be easy to relieve and to prevent,—but these pleasant anticipations did not continue long. The morning after my arrival at Lille I received a visit from the managing commissioners of the hospitals of that city.—‘Have you many poor?’ I enquired of their venerable president. ‘More than 32,000,’ he replied, ‘that is to say, more than half the population.’ His reply struck me with such surprise and terror, that I requested him to repeat it, that I might be certain of his meaning. It may easily be believed, that, from this time forward, the pauperism of French Flanders became the object of my unceasing attention. The origin, the cause, and the effect of this dreadful leprosy, whose existence I had been so far from suspecting, were, from that time, the constant subject of my thoughts and enquiries. By degrees I discovered that misery was advancing with equal rapidity in Artois; and in part of Picardy and Normandy; that it had long seized upon many provinces of Belgium and Holland; and, in short, that the distress of the English workmen was now fully shared by those of the north of France and the Low Countries.

“I should vainly attempt to give any idea of the state of want, of suffering, and of abject degradation, moral and physical, in which the indi-

gent workmen were plunged in the principal towns in the department of the north. I refer enquirers to my work for details, which are too afflicting to be given twice."—vol. i. p. 16.

M. de Villeneuve was bound by his official duties to endeavour to take the best measures to relieve the destitute within his department, rather than to follow up theoretical enquiries into the causes of their number and situation. He had, however, presented to the minister for the interior a project for the colonization of the indigent of France, which had been suggested to him by an attentive study of the results obtained in the colonies of Frederick-Oords, in Holland, when the revolution of July, and his refusal to serve the new sovereign, gave him the necessary time and leisure to extend and arrange his observations :

"I did not, however, believe," he writes after the revolution, "that I had fulfilled the sort of special mission which each man receives from Providence; I resolved to consecrate my leisure, and the little strength that was left to a shattered constitution, to a thorough investigation of the subject of pauperism, which the events of the times were constantly extending. In the bosom of a peaceful retreat, I endeavoured to call to mind my recollections and my experience; I consulted in turn political economy; the philosophical theories upon civilization, statistics, legislation; and those moral sciences which might have any connexion with the causes of indigence. At first, the horizon that offered itself to my attention seemed vague and immense. By degrees, and by the help of the brilliant light of Christianity, it seemed to me that one might clearly distinguish the causes of the moral and material disorders of society; and that the principal facts arranged themselves naturally in classes: it became possible to generalize them, and to assign to them distinct principles; to observe and to compare their consequences; and, in short, to make a near approach, if not to attain, to the truth."—vol. i. p. 20.

We perceive that in our author's views, *Christian Political Economy* is chiefly considered with a view to pauperism; and we must observe, that the increase of national wealth is in his mind only of second-rate importance. He is alarmed at the calamities entailed upon a generation not far distant, by a constant increase of the indigent part of the community; and the dangers which even now threaten property have the greater horrors for his imagination, because he wrote with the recollection of two revolts amongst the workmen of Lyons fresh in his mind. Thus, of the seven books of which his work is composed, the first only can be justly said to belong to political economy; and even in that he does not for an instant lose sight of his favourite idea; he considers the different agents of production only as they are connected with the amount of wages. And it is because, in his opinion, the accumulation and concentration of commercial capital, the universal use of machinery, and the formation of a new feudal system—whose barons would be bankers and manufacturers: their serfs the workman—would indefinitely

multiply the number of poor, that he opposes himself with vehemence, too often accompanied by exaggeration, to that system of commercial activity to which, however, England would still be indebted for her wealth, even although she should lay to its charge all the enormity of her poor's rates. But before we visit our author with the censure he justly deserves, for his blind antipathy to the factory system, we will explain the reasons upon which he has formed an opinion so opposite to all received notions. And we will begin by submitting to our readers the following statement of the poor who existed in Europe in 1830:*

Kingdoms of Europe.	Population.	Superficial Extent of Square Leagues (French).	Number of Inhabitants by Square Leagues.	Division of the Population into		Proportion of the Agricultural Population to the	Number of Indigent.	Proportion of the Number of Indigent to the General Population.	Number of Beggars.	Proportion of the Number of Beggars to the	
				Manufacturing.	Agricultural.					Indigent Population.	General Population.
England	23,400,000	11,319	2,071	9,560,000	14,040,000	2 : 3	3,900,000	1 : 6	200,000	1 : 19	1 : 117
Germany	13,600,000	12,625	1,109	10,200,000	3,400,000	3 : 1	680,000	1 : 20	68,000	1 : 10	1 : 200
Austria	32,000,000	23,220	1,377	25,600,000	6,400,000	4 : 1	1,280,000	1 : 25	160,000	1 : 8	1 : 200
Denmark	2,500,000	9,975	275	2,000,000	500,000	4 : 1	100,000	1 : 25	10,000	1 : 10	1 : 250
Spain	13,900,000	16,053	865	11,583,333	2,316,667	5 : 1	450,000	1 : 30	90,000	1 : 05	1 : 154
France	32,000,000	26,837	1,212	22,600,000	6,400,000	4 : 1	1,600,000	1 : 20	188,153	1 : 8	1 : 166
Italy	19,044,000	12,614	1,509	15,570,000	3,164,000	5 : 1	750,000	1 : 25	180,000	1 : 5	1 : 126
Low Countries	6,143,000	2,700	2,274	2,461,000	3,682,000	2 : 3	877,000	1 : 7	60,000	1 : 14.37.50	1 : 102
Portugal	3,580,000	3,680	957	2,941,665	588,335	5 : 1	141,000	1 : 25	28,200	1 : 5	1 : 121
Prussia	12,778,000	9,577	1,324	10,648,915	2,129,085	5 : 1	425,533	1 : 30	63,800	1 : 10	1 : 202
Russia	52,500,000	343,175	123	42,850,000	3,750,000	14 : 1	525,000	1 : 100	62,500	1 : 10	1 : 1008
Sweden	3,866,000	3,700	1,045	3,092,800	778,200	4 : 1	154,600	1 : 25	15,460	1 : 10	1 : 243
Switzerland ..	1,714,000	1,600	1,028	1,142,666	571,334	2 : 1	171,000	1 : 10	11,400	1 : 15	1 : 150
Turkey in Europe ..	9,580,000	25,925	331	8,312,500	1,167,500	7 : 1	142,500	1 : 40	14,250	1 : 10	1 : 166
Totals	528,475,000	503,108	461,225	401,777,552	48,692,121	34 : 1	10,807,383	1 : 50	1,121,763	1 : 9	1 : 191
(Round Numbers.)											8.11

The reader will scarcely appreciate the effect which was produced upon the imagination of the author by the results of the above tables, unless to these statistical details, which are so unfavourable to the richest countries in Europe, we add some remarks upon the state of France in particular. Amongst our neighbours manufacturing industry is very unequally divided; its principal seat is in thirty-two departments, situated for the most part to the north and east of the kingdom, the fifty-four others being exclusively dedicated to agriculture. If the general average of the poor is as one to twenty, this proportion does not give correctly the state either of the agricultural or of the manufacturing districts. Thus, in the department of the north the average number of poor is as one to six, and in the Pas de Calais as one to eight of the inhabitants; and in these two territorial divisions (the former especially) the manufacturing system has reached its highest point of prosperity. On the contrary, in the departments of Correze and Creuse, where there are no manufactories of any kind, the proportion of indigent is, in the first, one in forty-seven, in the second, one in fifty-six inhabitants. And M. de Villeneuve affirms, that if in the manufacturing districts a separation were made between the agricultural labourers they contain and those who work in the factories, the result for all France would be, one indigent out of five of the last, and only one in forty of the former. In France, therefore, the number of poor increases and decreases according to the preponderance of the factory over the agricultural population. The same remark applies to the crimes committed, and even to the physical infirmities of the people. Upon this last point much information may be derived from the conscription, which, under its present mitigated shape, furnishes some interesting documents concerning the health and conformation of young men who have attained the age of twenty. All, without exception, must be measured before the recruiting council, and examined by the surgeons who are attached to it; and in every point of view there is in the agricultural districts a superiority in physical strength, in morality, and in ease of circumstances; which is universally admitted. There are much fewer large fortunes, and consequently a much smaller circulating capital; but these provinces constitute the principal military strength of France, and their population is by far the most religious, and the most exempted from the vices which degrade humanity. The knowledge of these important facts, and perhaps also his habits of administration, often thwarted, and often alarmed by the seditious indocility of the French operatives, have naturally excited strong prejudices in the author against the excessive

development of the factory system; and the more so as his country cannot have the advantage of the extensive markets that are open to England in her Colonies. And even in those markets which are open equally to both countries, the greater skill of our manufacturers, and the immense capital they can command, give them a decided preference in most branches of industry. We cannot, therefore, be surprised that a French statesman should take alarm at an activity which produces a glut in the market at home; yet does not find a sufficient vent without. If we consider only the real advantage of France, opposed as she is to a nation with which she cannot successfully compete, except in the fabrication of a small number of articles of minor importance, we shall be a good deal disposed to agree with M. de Villeneuve. Undoubtedly the manufactures of France have made immense progress since 1815; her machines have been perfected, her artificers are less unskilful, the rate of interest lower, and had England remained stationary she might indeed have felt some uneasiness. But we, too, have advanced, and as long as we can undersell our neighbours, the progress they make can only serve to overstock their own market, and consequently to create a ruinous competition amongst their own manufacturers, which must reduce still lower the rate of wages. Even supposing that after new efforts, by withdrawing from agriculture the capital which it still requires, France should be able to fabricate goods as cheap as ours (surely she cannot hope to do more than this) what in fact would she gain? In the struggle that would then take place in every market in the world between her merchants and ours, supposing all else to be equal, success must depend upon the low price of labour; or, in other words, that country whose workmen could longest and most patiently endure hunger must in the end carry off the victory. In this race towards starvation, France must certainly give way the first, for she has not and cannot have the ruinous resource of a poor-tax, on account of the extreme subdivision of her landed property; and, moreover, with the factions that desolate her, and the levelling and democratic spirit of her people, the lower orders in France would not wait to attain so fatal a point,—they would rise against the government, be it what it might, and tear the wealth of the country from the hands of its actual possessors. Already is so much uneasiness excited by the temper of the workmen, that government has more than once acknowledged that the 400,000 soldiers who are so heavy a burden upon the tax-payers, are more necessary for the maintenance of internal tranquillity than for the defence of the national honour. What would be the fate of France if two bad harvests should success-

sively aggravate the distress of the labourer? or if, which would come to the same thing, the price of food remaining stationary, their means of procuring it should be diminished by a further reduction in their gains? This must be the necessary result of the most splendid success that the manufacturers of France can possibly anticipate; can we, therefore, be surprised if a French political economist, sincerely anxious for his country's welfare, should recoil from such a prospect, and deprecate for his countrymen a preeminence which they would buy so dearly? We are convinced that the opinions of the author would be generally adopted on the other side of the channel, if it were not that an immense capital is already engaged in manufactories, and if France possessed a landed interest sufficiently enlightened to understand the dictates of sound policy, and sufficiently compact to make them prevail. But if the peculiar circumstances of France seem to point out to her that she should attach herself in an especial manner to the improvement of agriculture, and to the cultivation of her millions of acres of waste land, does it follow that manufactories with their machines, their innumerable workmen, or even those lords of the shuttle whom M. de Villeneuve holds in such horror, should be radically and essentially bad? Look at Ireland, almost wholly agricultural, and in which the author himself computes 1,833,631 indigent.* No doubt what he says is true, that the long oppression under which that land of misrule has lain groaning, and the system of absenteeism, are the principal causes of so much misery. But, although these causes are easily proved, it is equally evident that the deplorable condition of the Irish tenantry must continue as long as the same number of hands shall seek their sole employment in agriculture. Whether then the superabundance of labour exists in the fields, or in the factories, the effect is the same as respects the profits of the labourers; and they must submit to consequences, which, however fearful, can only be averted by an increase in the demand, or a reduction in the supply. It is because the introduction of manufactories upon a large scale in Ireland would divert into another channel a considerable portion of the labour, which hangs at present so heavily on the agricultural market, that what has perhaps proved injurious to France would diffuse comfort and plenty among the afflicted cottagers of Ireland. When a nation has more hands and more capital than are required for agriculture, it must, unless it would see a ruinous competition established amongst its labourers, open new markets for its superfluous industry; and M. de Villeneuve

* More accurate information shews that the indigent exceed 2,300,000.

admits this fact, and wishes to encourage in his country what he calls national manufactories; that is to say, manufactories that are chiefly employed in working up the indigenous raw material. But again we repeat it, that nation which has more hands and more capital than it can employ in agriculture or in national manufactures, must, upon pain of being exposed to a redundancy of labour, extend the sphere of its industry, so as to take in the raw material of foreign countries. Undoubtedly it will then find, that the only means of keeping up the rate of wages is by an immense exportation; and machinery will become indispensable: and then follow those giant factories where millions of workmen are congregated. In fact, it is impossible to command foreign markets, and to sell in them, under the form of merchandize, the superabundant labour of the country, without possessing the advantage of cheapness. Now, the factory system, superior machinery, and unbounded capital, can alone insure the necessary degree of cheapness to encounter the accumulated difficulties of freight, high duties, and foreign competition. This is the present situation of England; and whatever, in another point of view, may be the consequences of this situation, she would certainly expose herself to far greater dangers should she allow the present sources of her greatness to dry up. Should the commercial progress of rival nations succeed in limiting the demand for her cotton goods to that of home consumption, then wages will fall with frightful rapidity; for the operatives, whose labour was formerly exported, would fall back upon the other manufactories, and carry with them that depreciation of wages which redundant labour must occasion wherever it exists. We admit that the necessity in which England finds herself to undersell her competitors, now that they have not only increased in number, but also possess large capital with an improved and improving machinery, has had, and must continue to have, a fatal effect upon the earnings of the labouring classes. Betwixt one country and another, the abundance of capital and of combustibles, the profits of merchants, machinery, and the wages of the workmen, are the principal elements of the difference in the money price of merchandize; and where there is much competition, the workmen cannot receive high wages in that country which is to obtain the superiority in cheapness, unless the interest of money and the price of combustibles should be lower, the gain of the manufacturer less, and machinery less dear and more efficient.

According, therefore, as the rival nations shall develop their credit, and work their coal mines more skilfully; in proportion as they perfect their machines, and concentrate their manufactories,

and thus reduce the gains of each manufacturer so as to carry them over a larger mass of productions, we shall be obliged, in the same degree, to lower the wages of our artizans; a great misfortune, doubtless, but which cannot be imputed to any of the causes to which it is attributed by M. De Villeneuve. The first commercial country in the world cannot preserve the high position she has attained to, except by outstripping all her competitors in the career that she has entered; and, so far from the English workmen having anything to fear from the improvement of machinery, a monopoly in the inventions of another Arkwright would suffice to restore them to all the comforts of former times. We are, then, far from agreeing with our author in the general principles he lays down in his first book. We cannot agree with him, because, as we have said, with him the whole question of political economy turns upon the subject of pauperism; and, consequently, instead of seeking the causes of the increase of national wealth, his attention is occupied almost exclusively in finding means to diminish the suffering of the lower orders. This is, indeed, the peculiar characteristic of the Catholic school; and, in our opinion, the writers of that school have not sufficiently attended to the difference which most unfortunately does exist between the available wealth of a nation—that wealth which constitutes the strength of government, because it implies the power of paying enormous taxes—and the high price of wages. If we do not deceive ourselves, in the present state of the world, a great and progressive accumulation of capital, without a corresponding decrease in the comforts of the majority of the people, is a blessing which, however desirable, cannot be obtained by the utmost efforts of human ingenuity. The reason is this; the money price of the articles of subsistence consumed by the workman, is always higher in rich than in poor countries; for in the first, money being much more abundant, has a smaller relative value. Twenty per cent. would not be too high to estimate the difference there is with respect to the necessaries of life, in the exchangeable value of money in France and England; so that, living in the first of these two countries, the workman requires only four fifths of the profits which, if he lived in the other, he must receive in order to obtain precisely the same quantity of comforts. Moreover, we cannot retain the monopoly of every open market in the world unless we are able to undersell our neighbours; that is, unless we can afford to sell our manufactured goods something under what to them would be a remunerating price; and, however small the reduction may be, it certainly is fully equal in value to another fifth of the labour exported. Thus the

French workmen have over ours an advantage of forty per cent., which they owe, first, to our greater wealth, and, secondly, to the necessity we are under of selling cheaper than any of our foreign competitors, in order to preserve our present proud pre-eminence, and continue to add to our existing capital. No doubt, if we were, as during the war, the only nation employing machinery and coals on a large scale, or if we had now, as then, the exclusive possession of the sea, this enormous difference would be more than compensated, and our operatives would have their due share in the general prosperity of the nation. Such unfortunately is not the case. Raw materials are now imported everywhere with equal facility, and, in some measure, our manufactory system, with its stupendous energies, has been adopted by every people that at all employ themselves with commerce. Our superiority, therefore, cannot be what it was in 1814. Though still great, it will not now enable our master manufacturers to give the same wages as formerly without the risk of no longer finding any foreign market for their surplus produce. The necessity they are thus placed under of curtailing the profits of their workmen, would not be much felt had not the competition between the manufacturers in France and Belgium caused a diminution in their wages and the price of their goods, which again, and in equal proportion, lessens the advantage we derive from the excellence of our machinery, the cheapness of our coals, and the yet unrivalled skill of our people. We have not now to undersell manufacturers who give enormous wages, we have to undersell manufacturers who give their artizans a bare subsistence; and thence it follows that our own have to endure such great and such inevitable privations. The advantages we possess must compensate for a loss of forty per cent (resulting, in the first place, from our wealth; in the second, from the condition on which alone we can hope to preserve that wealth) before our workmen can receive the equivalent in money of more than is allowed to their continental brethren. Their employers have no control over this great and primary cause of all their sufferings; and most reluctantly do we confess that we do not conceive the possibility of any permanent and real alleviation to a distress occasioned by the high price of provisions in England, combined with a corresponding distress in every country whose manufactories have outgrown the utmost limits of its own consumption. This is our position; and this will always be the position of a nation whose greatness is based at once on manufactories and foreign commerce, when she is surrounded by numerous and skilful rivals. She cannot extend her exportations and accumulate new capital, except by giving nearly the

same wages as they give: she will be forced to reduce them when they are reduced elsewhere; and, in the end, it will be much if the difference in the price of labour covers that of the relative value of money. If it were otherwise,—if, in a time of profound peace and growing prosperity for many commercial nations, the accumulation of capital by an immense export trade were compatible with high wages, the calculations we have borrowed from M. De Villeneuve's book would not show results so unfavourable for the richest nations of the world. Those which cannot find in foreign markets a sufficient vent for the superabundance of their produce, suffer from the excess of home competition; and that which surpasses them all in cheapness and in the excellence of means of production, suffers, in her turn, from being always obliged to undersell them, and therefore to reduce her prices as rapidly and as extensively as they reduce theirs. That there is comparatively, or rather, that there should have been in 1830, a smaller number of paupers in Spain than in England, can be a subject of wonder to no reflecting mind. The proverbial indolence of the Spaniard is a sufficient check against a redundancy of labour; and, as the supply is never equal to the demand, wages are too high to admit either of a lucrative intercourse with other countries, or the accumulation of an extensive circulating capital. In that country, which has for centuries been so badly governed, the higher classes are the greatest sufferers. As for artizans and labourers, they have each the certainty of finding an employer when he chooses it; and, except in a few instances, one might say, that almost all the misery existing there is voluntary. It is with commercial as with military supremacy. When keenly contested, both are won at a heavy cost; and, in the conquering army, whether victory be acquired by superior valour or by superior ingenuity, the heaviest loss falls always on the private soldiers.

But the consequences which result from a great accumulation of capital acquired by an immense export trade, are not an evil attaching exclusively to commerce. Agricultural countries, having a superabundance of production, and not being able to find foreign markets for their corn except at the lowest possible price, would be obliged to imitate the inertia of the Spaniard, or to reduce wages so as to sustain a competition ruinous to all parties: and this fact seems to have entirely escaped our author. However, we admit that this principal and most irremediable cause of the distress of the lower orders is not the only one; and we allow, with M. De Villeneuve, that there are secondary causes of a moral nature, by removing or diminishing which the condition

of the working classes might be greatly improved. We will enumerate them in his own words, reminding the reader that he is chiefly speaking of France;—

[“The different causes of public misery may be classed as follows :

“ On the part of the poor, —

“ 1. The want of employment, the inability or the refusal to work.

“ 2. Immorality, ignorance, want of foresight, absence of religious feeling.

“ On the part of the rich, —

“ 1. Want of charity, egotism, cupidity, monopoly of land, of capital, and of commerce.

“ 2. The excessive increase of manufactories.

“ 3. The forsaking agriculture and national industry.

“ On the part of government, —

“ 1. The vicious construction or imperfections of public charitable institutions, and of legislation generally upon the subject of the indigent and paupers.

“ 2. The abandonment of the principles of religion and charity, and the neglecting to introduce them into education, politics, morals, and institutions.

“ 3. The want of sufficient protection to agriculture, national industry, and internal commerce.

“ Lastly, on the part of charity herself, or rather of the persons who are actuated by her : —

“ 1. The preference given to personal alms over labour and other means of help that might be afforded to the poor.

“ 2. The habit, respectable, doubtless, but nevertheless faulty, of rather confining relief to immediate distress than seeking means for its future prevention.

“ 3. The want of plan, of arrangement, and of general association in the practice of charity.

“ 4. The delay or the negligence in appropriating for the relief of the poor, and in applying to institutions for charity and education, the improvements and discoveries that have been introduced into other establishments by political and domestic economy.”—vol. iii. p. 8.

It is easy to perceive in this summary the preference which the Catholic school gives to agriculture, and which, to say the least, is carried greatly too far. Another characteristic of this school may also be distinguished. It attaches great importance to the virtues inculcated by religion, to purity of morals, temperance, moderate desires, resignation, and charity; and that not only from the idea that they are indispensable to man's eternal welfare, but because they are necessary for the proper distribution and permanent increase of the wealth of the community. Our protestant friends may smile, perhaps, in pity, to learn that there are in France economists who have read Smith and Ricardo, Mill and M'Culloch, Senior and Malthus, and

who yet believe in the temporal utility of the celibacy of the clergy; fancying that monastic orders, auricular confession, fasting, abstinence, and alms, contribute much to the progress of general prosperity; and who even insist that the pomp of Catholic worship, and (shall we own it?) the *IDOLATROUS* worship of images, are calculated to exercise an influence, that nothing else can replace, over the fine arts, and the manufactures which depend upon them. These are startling paradoxes, and yet those who advance them are not ignorant fanatics; they have lived in the world, and know it; and their minds are unbiassed by the necessity of justifying any of the tenets of the Church to which they belong; for all lay down the principle, that the truth of no creed is to be tested by the effect it produces upon the earthly happiness of its followers. Thus, for instance, when they affirm the usefulness in this life of confession, they are downright utilitarians, and confine themselves as strictly as Jeremy Bentham could have wished to the natural results of the sacrament of penance with respect to the temporal welfare of society. Nay, they are not all Catholics; and, if MM. De Ville-neuve, Rubichon, and Raineville, profess the same faith with ourselves, MM. De Morogues, Huerne Pommese, and many other French economists, who agree with them in all respects, and whose works have lately appeared, have no pretension to the title of orthodox believers. Their agreement is, therefore, remarkable; and we could not account for it if the progress of pauperism in France inspired less terror in these latter writers. There are no poor taxes in France, and the sources by which they are replaced would be altogether insufficient, if private charity were not so extremely powerful as it is in that country. Some idea may be formed of this by the following account of the ways and means which, in the department of the north, are annually made applicable to the wants of an indigent population:—

	francs.	cents.
Offices for the distribution of charity	754,857	7
Municipal contributions	220,985	0
Hospitals for the sick, old people, and orphans	1,780,831	31
Hospitals for foundlings	240,000	0
Total	<u>2,996,673</u>	<u>38</u>

The number of indigent inscribed upon the books of the offices for charity only (which, it should be stated, have the disposal of the municipal contributions) amounted, so long since as 1828, to 168,453. The following is an official account of them:—

1. Indigent on account of old age	6000
2. Indigent on account of infirmities	16,000
3. Indigent in consequence of misfortunes	12,000
4. From too large families	50,000*
5. From want, or from insufficiency of work	44,000*
6. Through misconduct	35,453
Total	163,453

Were a division to be made amongst this mass of poor, of the sums destined for their relief, it will be seen, that each individual would receive annually the sum of about four shillings,—and these insignificant alms have now become less, as the number of poor has greatly increased since 1830. In 1834, the author considered that the number of poor had already increased by two hundred and fifty-two thousand, out of which the department of the north had a large part. It is easy to imagine the alarm that is felt at such a rapid progression, and in this alarm the government fully participates, since every year it allows enormous sums for the execution of public works, avowing fairly, that their purpose is to give work to the lower orders. 100,000,000 francs were voted three years ago for that purpose,—and if it is impossible not to admit the excellence of such a system of charity, it is equally impossible on the other hand not to see that in the end it will constitute the heaviest item in the budget, if the misery occasioned by the want of work and the low rate of wages should continue to increase as rapidly as it has done since 1815. Those men who are determined at any price to oppose that destruction of the rights of property which the St. Simoniens advocate, and who, nevertheless, have lost all confidence in the theories of the economists of Smith's school, from the mass of wretchedness which exists wherever those theories have been fully carried out, whether Catholics or not Catholics, are naturally seeking some other method; and the moral regeneration of the rich and of the poor, appears to them the *only means* of saving society from the most terrible catastrophes. It is evident that the American crisis, and the danger to which we have been more than once exposed by the complicated state of our currency, and the mania for speculations, have greatly contributed to fortify these new ideas. It is the prevailing notion of these bold innovators, that the very existence, even of nations the most advanced in arts and civilization, is now in the greatest danger, and they are disposed to sacrifice the exterior prosperity of France, in order to restore her that internal security, which

* Of these two classes, the half may consist of children.

they value more highly, and which she has lost. The dangers pointed out by M. de Villeneuve arise from two sources—first, the number of workmen fallen, no matter from what cause, into indigence; and secondly, the number of workmen who every year increase that amount; his great object is, therefore, to discover the best means to relieve the former, and to save the latter from the fate which hangs over them. For the first, such of them at least as are unable through age and infirmities to earn their bread, he recommends the establishment of asylums at the expense of the state, which should be sufficiently large, and sufficiently well-endowed, to receive them all. The author does not participate in the dislike felt by most of our political economists for these sort of establishments. He has a real respect for the poor; he respects them as a Catholic, who sees in them the suffering members of Jesus Christ: and here again the school to which he belongs reasons upon utilitarian principles. They maintain that the arguments made use of to demonstrate the necessity of depriving the lower orders of all resources but what they may find in their wages, can have no effect but that of exasperating and driving them to a sanguinary retaliation. As the insults continually offered to their improvidence or their distress, and the empty threat of leaving them to their fate, cannot in reality save the country a farthing, they ask if it would not be wiser to seek to inspire them with a sincere affection for the richer classes. Either, they say, the workmen must be reduced to a convenient number, by extermination, as the dogs are killed in hot weather when they become too numerous, or they must be so treated, that they may feel a sincere and lively gratitude to their superiors. The first method is impracticable; the Catholic school urges our having recourse to the second, and lays down upon this point the fundamental axiom, that *the poor love only those who love them*, and that such will have no cause to fear the effects of a misery which it had not been in their power to prevent. With a view to originate and develop this love of the rich in the poor, the author wishes to have established as many charitable commissions as there are parishes in France, who might assist all other classes of indigent, by finding work for such as want it, giving supplemental wages under particular circumstances, and in extreme cases, which are not likely to be durable, by giving immediate relief. These commissions, which would have no funds but what they derived from private charity, should all depend upon one central commission, to be established at Paris; and they would be composed of the most respectable persons in each district. It is superfluous to say that the clergy would have great influence in them, for the

author thinks it even more urgent to apply remedies to the moral than to the physical evils of the working classes. The idleness of some, the intemperance of others, and the want of economy and foresight in all, greatly contribute to their common misery; and it is by the aid of religion, and by appeals to their consciences, made through the intervention of a priest, that he hopes to amend vices so baneful and destructive to society. He has no confidence in the efficacy of any other method,—and he thinks, as we do, that the working classes will only laugh at the weakness of those who would preach up the virtues which are opposed to the interests of future generations, of the community at large, and even of the labouring classes themselves, deeply as they are interested, in not allowing the supply of labour to exceed the demand. It is true, that the rate of wages cannot be affected by the good or bad conduct of any individual. Wages will neither rise nor fall whether he has ten natural children for instance, or whether he has none: whether he is singular in having them or in not having them, his personal morality has no conceivable influence upon his earnings, present or future; but it does immensely influence his eternal happiness; and if he has faith, he will almost always yield to a motive so directly affecting his personal felicity. After all, why need the economist, even if an unbeliever, concern himself with the motive which is appealed to, provided it is adequate to free his country from the intolerable weight of illegitimate births? These births, in France only, amount to upwards of eighty thousand a year,—it will not therefore be too much to compute at eight hundred thousand the total number of labourers, male and female, who have been born out of wedlock. Suppose that in that country morals were so pure, that all the children could name their mothers without a blush, population would be the smaller by eight hundred thousand adults, and the demand for labour would exceed the supply.

M. de Villeneuve does not disclaim any of the other means devised latterly to teach the people habits of order and economy. He approves of the savings banks, and even of temperance societies,—but he considers them only as useful auxiliaries to religion, and it is from religion, and from her ministers, the unmarried clergy of Catholicism—who alone are without family ties, and who alone therefore can devote themselves entirely to the moral amelioration of the people—that he demands the salvation of France.

We shall not follow the author through the details he has given respecting the different sorts of misery now weighing like a nightmare over the nations of modern Europe, although these

details are most extensive and most interesting. He has made immense researches, not only in his own country, but also over all Europe; and we do not think there is a book in existence which contains so complete and full a statistical account of the actual miseries of humanity. On this head, his book leaves nothing to be wished for,—and the statesman, as well as the political economist, will find in it an ample harvest of facts and observations equally new and important. To the labourer, whom the declining rate of wages is hurrying so rapidly into misery, he always proposes the same remedy—religion, which will deliver him from factitious wants, and will increase his wages, by enabling him to use a rigorous economy in spending them. But not to the poor alone does he consider religion so necessary; he invokes it for the rich,—that if she teaches resignation to the one, she may moderate the avidity of the other by stimulating their charity; that by their disinterestedness, fortified by Christian philanthropy, the resignation of the poor may be made easier.

M. de Villeneuve is also most anxious for the execution of a great project, the colonization of all the uncultivated lands of France; and he proves, that if government would take this up, and distribute the millions of acres that now lie waste amongst those who are indigent for want of work, the redundancy of labour from which France is now so grievously suffering would presently disappear. He is not afraid of the expense of the plan, for he shews that it would be amply covered, partly by the new revenues that would accrue to the government, partly by the saving of expense to public and private charity. This part of the work is open to serious objections, which the reader will at once perceive,—we shall therefore close our review by a rapid sketch of the opinions of the Catholic school as respects pauperism.

These doctrines, as they are laid down in the small number of books and pamphlets which have up to this day been published in France by Catholic economists, have not as yet been collected in any one work. But, if we understand them rightly, they are all based upon the great historical fact, of the existence of slavery in every nation that had not received Christianity; and of the transformation which by slow and successive degrees the people underwent under the influence of Catholicism, from the slaves of ancient times, to free men enjoying all the rights of citizenship. Why, with the single exception of the vagabond tribes who lived by hunting and fishing, and were scarcely raised above the brutes in the scale of civilization, did there everywhere exist, before the coming of our Saviour, and why does there still exist in

many places, so large a proportion, very often the greater part, of the people, bowed down under the yoke of a detestable servitude? Why do the philosophers of antiquity, Plato as well as Epictetus, Zeno as well as Epicurus, all agree in considering slavery as a necessity inherent in the nature of all human societies, and not less indispensable to their existence than the right of property? And again, why did the slaves even in their most successful revolts, never think of protesting against the principle of slavery, and of invoking the rights of man? It is, reply the Catholic economists, because this odious institution was, in fact, what Aristotle believed it, a condition of existence for all these nations. They could not dispense with it, either for the interests of the masters, or even of the slaves themselves; for slavery is the poor-tax of those people who do not know the divine command of charity, or who are not so organized as to draw from it all the consequences to which it ought to lead. What must have become of the Roman or Athenian artisan in a year of famine, or when sickness hindered him from working, if he had not been able to sell his children, or himself? Who would have supported him or his family if he had received nothing from a patron or from the state? To have refused him the *privilege* of slavery would have been to condemn him to a death from starvation, whether his distress had been occasioned by misconduct, improvidence, or circumstances independent of his will. Had Christian charity been at hand to maintain him for a little while, till his strength returned, or till food became more abundant, or till he had obtained work, he might have lived and remained free; but charity was unknown to the pagans, and a few days are an eternity to the man that wants bread. They were therefore obliged to authorize slavery, as a safeguard from perpetual revolts,—or otherwise the poor, condemned by the decree of the rich to the sufferings of hunger, must have sought a quicker death, by the overthrow of the state. But when the principle of charity is reduced to a simple precept, it cannot suffice for the deliverance of the working classes. However charitable the rich man may be, he has other duties to fulfil than that of exploring the depths of human misery; and he has not the time to weigh with attention the claims of those who entreat his compassion. It will generally happen that the most importunate receive his assistance, and that his means are exhausted before the *real* poor can reach him: moreover, the real objects of charity have wants that daily change; their number varies in different places and in different years: it will also generally happen, that the district or parish which contains the most poor, contains the fewest rich inhabitants; and individual charity can

neither go to a distance to seek out its proper objects, nor to prepare help for future generations. Therefore, that charity may be efficacious—that she may not fritter away her funds—but may have sufficient for all lawful demands, she requires the assistance of men, who shall make the care of the poor their special occupation—who can distinguish between truth and imposture—and who are the regular receivers and distributors of the offerings of the rich. These men must form a corporation, which never dies, that the stamp of perpetuity may be placed upon such of their acts as are done with reference to the good of posterity: they must also be brought by their other duties into constant contact with the rich; neither below them, nor above the poor, that they may be intermediate between both, soliciting from the one in the name of the other, and looked upon by all with equal confidence. But can this confidence be obtained by married men? Will not the rich fear that their gifts will go to enrich the wife and children of the receiver, if he has a family, or to feed his luxury if his profession allow him the same enjoyments as to other men?—and may not the poor, to whom he can never give all that they will ask, entertain the same suspicion? Let us not forget that he must have a discretionary power; he will have secret misery to relieve; and the necessity of keeping accounts of his receipts and expenditure would be alone sufficient to prevent his accepting an employment entirely optional, and which can never be forced upon him. The Jews had, indeed, received the precept to love their neighbours; but they had no corporation possessing the requisites we have here enumerated; and on this account, the principle of slavery, the right of man to alienate his own liberty, subsisted amongst them. If, say the Christian economists, the Catholic Church succeeded at length in abolishing this frightful necessity, it is because she possessed what was wanting under the Mosaic dispensation—an unmarried clergy, whose members—dispersed over all parts of Catholic countries—the natural confidants and consolers of all that were in grief—the necessary visitants of all that were in sickness—having no other families than their flocks—and cut off by the austerity of their calling from all expensive pleasures—were wonderfully adapted to this service of charity, which forms one of their principal functions. No doubt many deceived the confidence inspired by their holy ministry; but the bulk of the clergy must necessarily have deserved that confidence, which by a few may have been put to scandalous uses;—they were the exceptions which confirmed the rule, and the rule is abundantly exemplified in history. Those Christians who separated from the Church of Rome before the conquest of civil liberty, the

Greeks in Russia and the East, and the Eutychians in Abyssinia, have not made one step towards the emancipation of the working classes; yet these classes had long been free in the west of Europe when Luther appeared. The Reformation, then, has done nothing for the overthrow* of slavery in those countries from whence it has disappeared; the honour of this great work belongs entirely to the Catholic Church,—and the Catholic Church could never have worked such a prodigy, if an immense majority of her clergy had not worthily fulfilled their mission.

But the Church could not at her birth have proclaimed universal emancipation without culpable imprudence; it was necessary that her priests should be spread abroad wherever there were poor; that the rich themselves should be penetrated with the maxims of the Gospel; that hospitals should be founded, and large sums amassed, before civil liberty could become a real benefit to the slaves: it was also necessary that they themselves should be gradually trained to the new existence which the Church was preparing for them; that together with their improvidence, they should lose the vices inherent in their state of degradation. Thus, universal emancipation, which was impossible without the assistance of a clergy so constituted as that of the Catholic Church, could not even with that assistance take place until after the lapse of many generations. And this explains why amongst those nations which were the last to join the Catholic unity, the Poles and the Hungarians, slavery still existed, at the time when Protestantism came to paralyze, even in Catholic countries, the progress of the Church. Time had been wanting to her. Thus the Catholic Church authorized in the first instance, and was bound to do so, the principle of slavery, until the slaves themselves were able to dispense with this frightful poor-tax; but she immediately gave her attention to their fate, making it an obligation upon their masters to treat them with gentleness, and multiplying their days of rest, under the name of *religious festivals*.

* The stat. 1 Edw. VI. cap. 3, singularly illustrates the theory mentioned in the text:—after reciting *the foolish pity and mercy* of those who ought to have suppressed vagabondry, and stating, that “*if they should be punished by DEATH, whipping, or imprisonment,....it were not without their deserts, and would be for the benefit of the commonwealth....yet it is desirable they be made profitable.*” The stat. enacts, “that any person idling and loitering for three days, should be marked with hot iron on the breast with the letter V....should be a *slave* for two years....should be fed with bread, water or small drink, and refuse meat....should be made to work by beating chains or otherwise....*be the work never so vile....if absent fourteen days during the two years, be branded on the forehead or ball of the cheek with hot iron, with the letter S, and to be a SLAVE FOR EVER: if he run away a second time, to be a felon.*” This was the third legislative act of the youthful head of the Anglican Church; the second being “An Act for the *Election of Bishops*” by THE KING.

In this manner the gains of the master were doubly diminished,—the slave cost more and worked less; so that the first, no longer receiving the same benefit, nor the second enduring the same suffering from slavery, both came, in the end, to look with a sort of indifference upon the triumph of civil liberty. But for these precautions, frightful catastrophes must have accompanied that triumph; for the murders and burnings which, in modern times, desolated St. Domingo, would have been carried on on an immense scale. By degrees, as charitable funds accumulated, and the education of the slaves improved, the Catholic Church took bolder steps for their deliverance. So early as the eleventh century, Pope Alexander III proclaimed that civil liberty was the right of ALL Christians; and the whole discipline of Catholicism seems calculated to procure it for them. Amongst those who ridicule the doctrine of purgatory, there are certainly not a few whose ancestors owed their enfranchisement to that belief; for there was no practice more common (as may be seen from the formularies of Marculphe) than to give slaves to the Holy Virgin, to St. Peter, or to some other saint, in order to obtain the repose of a soul whom the donor believed to be in Purgatory; this gift implying that of liberty to the slave. Thus gradually, without political convulsion, without, in fact, its being observed by the world, they were transformed into free labourers; so free, that the right of selling themselves was taken from them. But the Church thus contracted an immense responsibility towards them. They would have cursed her, if, by the new privileges with which they were invested, they had been placed in danger of wanting the bread which, although bitter, was abundant in their slavery.

Never can charity, however powerful, secure the existence of workmen whose labour does not suffice for their ordinary wants. She may take charge of widows and orphans, of the infirm and the sick, and of those who require temporary assistance in temporary difficulties; but this is all. The Church had, then, two things to do; in the first place, so to organize charity as that it should afford protection only to the real poor; in the second, to watch that the price of labour should be as high as possible. The first of these two duties her ministers fulfilled with ease. The clergyman of each parish knew all the inhabitants of it; he could not be deceived respecting them; and his influence was so much the more useful, as he could threaten to leave to their fate such families as were, through their own misconduct, in danger of indigence. How many illegitimate births may have been prevented; how many improvident marriages given up, or at least postponed, at the voice of the pastor? Thus was ensured an extreme economy in the distribution of relief, and a check

which can only be exercised by an unmarried clergy. Nor did the Church act less wisely with respect to the rate of wages. The old Dutch East Indian Company, in order to keep up the price of their spices, burned a part of those which they gathered in abundant years. The Church did the same; she consumed a part of the labour of the workmen by the multitude of her religious festivals; and the labourer then sold his remaining working days more dearly than he would have sold the whole year of labour, if he had consented to work all the year: and in the pomp of these festivals were held out to him unexpensive enjoyments, which turned his mind from more costly pleasures. The Church had nicely calculated that the labourer should *gain the most* and *expend the least* that was possible. The Catholic economists assert, that the Reformation, by suppressing ecclesiastical celibacy, has rendered powerless the different clergy which it has created; and that, by suppressing festivals, it has brought into the market that superabundance of labour which is now mistaken for a redundancy of population; for, supposing, in addition to the fifty-two Sundays, fifty-two festivals in the year, the catholic workman would only carry five days of the week into the labour market; and, as the Protestant workman carries six, whatever nation became Protestant, did, in fact, increase the general amount of its labour by one fifth. The countries in which the Reformation prevailed, could, in consequence, pay smaller wages, and undersell their rivals; thus accumulating the capital with which they afterwards founded immense factories. The manufactories of Italy and Spain were crushed. Those of Belgium lost their ancient splendour; and those of France, after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, fell again into a state of languor. Another cause both of ruin and of prosperity was added to this: the Protestant workmen, whose religion is so destitute of pleasure, sought for other and dearer amusements; he consumed more, and he laboured more. At first, indeed, his wages rose, while the real value of his labour fell; for he gave a larger portion of it each day for the money he received. This was an additional fatigue to him, and soon it was no longer a profitable one, for to sustain their competition with Protestant countries, Catholic manufacturing nations, in the end, gave up their festivals, and in respect of industry became Protestant. Thus the barriers which the Catholic church wisely established against the redundancy of labour, and its consequent depreciation, have been every where broken down. Every where the workman carries the same number of days' labour into the market, and every where there

is a superabundance of working hands and a depreciation of the price which they receive, which takes from Protestant countries the advantages they enjoyed, while they alone limited the rest of the workmen to the Sunday. "Suppress," say the writers whose views we are now stating, "the rest of the Sunday, and the condition of the workmen will become intolerable, and poor-taxes will shortly absorb the whole revenue of the land."

The Catholic writers, therefore, look upon the working-classes as the representatives of the slaves of former times, and consider that they cannot retain their liberty—or, at least, cannot retain it upon such terms as to make it advantageous to them—except with the help of those institutions, by means of which they first acquired it. We will not go farther in our exposition of a system which appears to us more open to objections in its practical part, than in its theory. We have wished to give to our readers a sketch of the new views which are now taken by men of indisputable merit. They acknowledge frankly that the remedies they propose can scarcely by possibility be adopted in the present state of the world; and they hardly attempt to conceal the sadness of their forebodings as to the future destiny of society.

- ART. IX.—*Descent of the Danube, from Ratisbon to Vienna, during the Autumn of 1827, with anecdotes and recollections, historical and legendary, of the towns, castles, monasteries, &c. upon the banks of the river, and their inhabitants and proprietors, ancient and modern.* By J. R. Planché, author of "Lays and Legends of the Rhine," "Oberon," an Opera, &c. 8vo. London. 1828.
2. *A Steam Voyage down the Danube, with Sketches of Hungary, Wallachia, Servia, Turkey, &c.* By Michael J. Quin, Author of "A Visit to Spain." Third edition, with additions. In two volumes. Post 8vo. London. 1836.
 3. *Austria and the Austrians.* In two volumes. Post 8vo. London. 1837.
 4. *Three Voyages in the Black Sea to the coast of Circassia: including descriptions of the ports, and the importance of their trade, with sketches of the manners, customs, religion, &c. of the Circassians.* By the Chev. Taitbout de Marigny, Consul of his Majesty the King of the Netherlands, at Odessa. 8vo. London. 1837.

5. *Travels in Circassia, Krim Tartary, &c. including a Steam Voyage down the Danube, from Vienna to Constantinople, and round the Black Sea, in 1836.* By Edmund Spencer, Esq. Author of "Sketches of Germany and the Germans," &c. In two volumes. 8vo. London. 1837.
6. *Report on the Commerce of the Ports of New Russia, Moldavia, and Wallachia, made to the Russian Government, in 1835, in pursuance of an investigation, undertaken by order of Count Woronzow.* Translated from the original, published at Odessa, by T. F. Triebner. Post 8vo. London. 1836.
7. *A Geographical, Statistical, and Commercial Account of the Russian Ports of the Black Sea, the Sea of Azoph, and the Danube; also an official Report of the European Commerce of Russia, in 1835.* From the German. With a map. 8vo. London. 1837.

WE have now before us the materials, which, until the publication of Mr. Spencer's work, our literature, or indeed that of any other nation, had not before acquired, for a complete description of the Danube and its borders, from its fountains in the Black Forest to the Black Sea. We are relieved also, chiefly by Mr. Spencer's assistance, from the labour of consulting numerous volumes, in order to obtain some idea of the principal ports of the Euxine; of the "wild and wondrous" scenery which characterizes its shores; of the various tribes of the human family by which those shores are occupied; and, above all, of the revolutions which the miraculous agency of steam is preparing throughout that world of waters—a world hitherto almost as unknown as America was before the discoveries of Columbus.

Fifty years ago, the Turkish flag alone waved in the Bosphorus, the Euxine, and the Danube. Russia, by the treaty of Kainardji, obtained the right of navigating that sea in 1774. A similar privilege was conceded to other countries about thirty years afterwards; but it was frequently interrupted by war, or by the caprice of the Turkish government, until 1829, when by the arrangements concluded at the peace between Russia and the Porte, the passage through the Hellespont and Bosphorus was opened for ever to the mercantile flags of all nations. Nevertheless, down to a very late period—we might say so late as four years ago—nothing was known of the vast resources presented to commercial enterprize by the first river in Europe. The populous cities, towns, and villages, the dense forests, the teeming fields, along its borders of full sixteen hundred miles in

length, seemed to have been wrapped in a universal lethargy, and so they would doubtless have remained hybernating for centuries yet to come, had they not been touched by the wand of that enchanter, who is now traversing all lands and waters, and summoning them to new stages of existence, that as we rise with them, still, like new Alps, rise higher above our heads, baffling all conjecture as to the destinies to which they may ultimately lead.

It was curious to hear—as it was our fortune to have heard—some of the countless objections that were at first urged against the plans of those men, who introduced the steam-boat in the eastern waters of Europe. The Austrians were too poor, the Hungarians too lazy, the Servians too ignorant, the Turks too sedentary, the Wallachians too barbarous, the Greeks too contemptible, to afford it anything like adequate support; and the Moscovite, bearing with all his weight upon the failing energies of the Sultan, ambitious to grasp the whole power and monopolize all the commerce upon which he could lay his colossal arm, from the Baltic to the Dardanelles, would never, it was said, permit that element to contend against him, which, once set in motion, he could never hope to control.

The very first steamer that went down the Danube, set the question at rest as to the profits of the speculation. The eyes of the apathetic Austrian were opened, when he found it returning with a cargo that ensured him, upon a moderate calculation, seven per cent. upon his shares. Before the end of the first season, that seven was raised to ten. The Hungarian, who, when he first saw the tall sooty cylinder shooting its column of smoke into the air, and leaving a long track of mysterious cloud behind it, ran away into his hut or his forest as if he had beheld a demon, anticipated even the Austrian in leaping on the deck, and revelling in the luxurious rapidity with which he was conveyed, even against the current, from Moldava to Presburg. The Servian and the Wallachian, with a shrewdness for which they had before obtained no credit, saw at once that the new political existence which they had acquired, would soon be converted into real independence by the aid of that friendly visitor. The Russians speedily found out, that the game was of that sort at which two could play, and built a fleet of steam-boats of their own. Without the Birmingham engine, that despiser of protocols, Greece, though elevated diplomatically to the rank of a kingdom, would have already fallen back into anarchy. And as to the “sedentary” Turks, let Mr. Spencer be heard, immediately after he enters the “Crescent,” an English steamer, on its way, not along the Turkish coast of the Danube, where the auto-

maton had already ceased to be a novelty, but from *Varna to Trebizond* :—

“The ‘Crescent’ was literally filled with passengers: the greater number Turks. The passion of these people for travelling in a steam-boat, who at first would not enter one, is now so great, that it may almost be termed a mania; but this is in consonance with the general tenor of their character; when once excited by any new change, or popular reform, their enthusiasm knows no bounds. I have seen the steam-packet bureaus in Constantinople besieged by multitudes in search of tickets, having no more important business than the enjoyment of an agreeable trip; and never was a Margate steamer, in the height of the season, more densely crowded than those which leave Constantinople. You may, therefore, easily imagine what a lucrative speculation the navigation of these seas by steam has been for the proprietors. To a European it was not a little amusing to observe their movements on deck: each Turk, armed with his little carpet, provender-bag, and telibouque, appeared the very picture of contentment.”—vol. ii. p. 187-8.

So much for the Turk, whose modern antipathy to locomotion was represented to be as invincible as his propensity to emigration was at the Hegira! In the same “Crescent,” moreover, were assembled Armenians, Greeks, and Jews, in their varied costumes, turbans, and caps, of both sexes, and of every age and tongue.

“Surely,” adds Mr. Spencer, “the world has never witnessed an invention better adapted than steam to connect the inhabitants of the earth by the same ties of religion, habits, customs, and manners; in one word, to effect a complete moral revolution. Its influence has been already felt by the benighted inhabitants of those beautiful countries on the banks of the Danube; and, if to this we add rail-roads, with their steam-carriages, which, from their convenience and celerity, must, in process of time, become universal, what may we not expect in a few years?”

“Do we not already see the whole of the nations of the East, wherever the arms of Europe or her commerce have penetrated, beginning to evince a taste for European habits? They are partial to our clothes, furniture, and even fashions. In the Ottoman empire we find not only the Sultan, but his grandees, who only a few months since ate with their fingers, and sat upon the ground, now making use of tables, chairs, knives, forks, and spoons, and furnishing their apartments with costly looking-glasses, chiffoniers, secretaires, chests of drawers, &c.: and I assure you, in a few years, we shall find that they will entirely conform to the customs and manners of Europe. At present I do not know a speculation more likely to prove profitable, than to send cargoes of furniture to Constantinople, and other large towns in Turkey and the East; and any of my mercantile readers who may act upon this hint, will remember with gratitude the writer of these letters.

“In short, a volume would scarcely suffice to tell the advantages of steam, and the consequences it is likely to produce. Even now, a man leaving London is carried into the heart of Germany by steam; he has then only to take post and traverse Bavaria and part of Austria to Vienna, where steam-boats are waiting to carry him to Constantinople. This immense distance, the most agreeable tour that can be performed, may be completed at a trifling expense, and in the short space of, at most, twenty days, without the slightest fatigue, not even the loss of a single night's rest.

“What other mode of travelling than steam could unite the various nations by which I am now surrounded—circumcised and uncircumcised mingling together in the happy bonds of fellowship? Before the appearance of steam-boats in these seas, Franks were regarded by the blinded fanatic followers of Mahomet as barbarians; now they are lauded to the skies: here, I have been travelling for days in the company of a Turk; we ate out of the same provender-bag, drank out of the same cup, and felt for each other the same kindly feelings of the sincerest friendship.”—vol. ii. p. 189-190.

Five years ago, there was not a single steam-boat to be seen in the Euxine. There are now eight or ten established at Odessa and Sebastopol, which ply between those ports and Galatz, Varna, Trebizond, Constantinople, and Smyrna. Three years ago, the communications between Constantinople and Smyrna were kept up by means of a solitary packet, which sometimes, with favourable winds, completed its voyage in seventy hours, but frequently, in consequence of the very changeable breezes in the Archipelago, was a week or a fortnight, or even longer, upon its way. The fares were so high that few persons availed themselves of this conveyance; and it was at length given up. Lately two steamers have been put upon that station. They accomplish the voyage in thirty hours with certainty, and the greatest facility. While we are writing, the Turkish watermen of the Golden Horn and the Bosphorus, a numerous race, comprising from fifteen to twenty thousand men, and reputed to have inherited all the fanaticism of the extinct Janissaries, are in mutiny against the power of steam, which threatens, they say, to consign them and their families to ruin. In consequence of their hostility, the steamers between Constantinople and Smyrna have been compelled to suspend their operations. This is one of the checks which the progress of civilization is destined uniformly to encounter; but no arm—not all the population of Stamboul combined—can now repel for any considerable time this vital power from those seas.

There is no nation to which the steam-boat is more essential, or upon which it has already, considering the brief period of its existence there, conferred more signal advantages, than upon

Greece. Horace's ode, "Prensus in Ægeο," has celebrated the variable character of the winds, and the manifold perils attending the navigation, of that part of the Mediterranean. Those difficulties and dangers may now be said to exist only in his poetry. Three years ago, if a traveller desired to proceed from Smyrna to Napoli, or the Piræus, he might have deemed himself fortunate if he had not to wait three weeks for a small bark between the former port and Hydra; the passage thither would have cost him at least three weeks more, and at Hydra he would still have had to confide in fortune for the discovery of some coaster which might enable him to accomplish his object! The whole voyage is now performed in thirty hours. At this moment steamers may be seen smoking in all directions to or from the Piræus. An *omnibus* conducts the traveller in two hours from the port to Athens, over a Mac-Adamised road, which three years ago was a wretched bridle path, interspersed with brushwood and rocks! A railroad will soon convey him over the same interval in twenty-five minutes. The consequence of these changes is already simply this—that round the Piræus, where four years ago scarcely even a hut was to be seen, a *town* has already grown up; and Athens itself, which the Turks left a pile of ruins, is at this moment one of the most beautiful capitals in Europe!

But the perfection of this mighty innovation, in our opinion, consists in the fact, to which Mr. Spencer has alluded, that wherever it appears, the spirit of constant, untiring improvement, which peculiarly characterizes the civilization of England, is sure to follow in the wake of the paddles. The complaint of the caique owners and rowers in the Bosphorus, is not so much that their trade is injured by the steam-boats; on the contrary, the truth is, that the facility thus given to strangers to visit the "City of the Sultan," has very materially increased their trade. It is their prejudices which have taken the alarm. They behold a foreign *power* in activity before their eyes, which menaces the destruction of their ancient habits, is already breaking up their barbarous circle of ideas, is undermining their religion, and must affect their entire existence as a portion of a people who have always considered themselves as only "encamped" in Europe. The Turks, in general, begin to see that either they must quit Europe or become Europeans. The feeling manifested on the Bosphorus has shown itself with equal force upon the Danube. Had the Austrians not possessed the right, by positive treaty, to the free navigation of that river, the steam-boat never would have been allowed to pass Belgrade in 1834. Even in 1836, Mr. Spencer mentions an impediment, which is in every way characteristic of all the parties engaged.

" Upon approaching the Turkish fortress Neu-Orsova, an officer belonging to the garrison hailed the vessel, and informed us that unless we were provided with a firman we could not pass: this intelligence was anything but agreeable, for neither the captain nor any of the passengers, possessed the desired document. The matter was long debated between the captain of the steam-boat and several Austrian officers, passengers; and at length it was agreed that we should return to Alt-Orsova till the firman could be procured. I found, however, that the captain, a very spirited man, was inclined to go forward, on the ground that permission had been already generally accorded for the free navigation of the Danube; I therefore proposed to the Austrian Major, that we should proceed together to the fortress, and learn from the Pacha himself the cause of our detention. After long debating the matter, *pro* and *con*, like a true German, he at length consented; and accordingly, attended by an officer of the sanitary-guard, we set off for the fortress, a miserable half-ruined building.

" We were immediately introduced to the Pacha, a fair-complexioned fine-looking man, about forty years of age, with a most patriarchal beard; he was dressed in the Turkish uniform, a dark blue frock coat, light blue pantaloons, and a red cloth cap with a very large blue silk tassel. He received us most affably, and his manners would have done no discredit to a courtier of St. James's. Previous to commencing our negotiation, coffee was brought in, which, as is invariably the case in Turkey, was excellent, and served in a style of much elegance. The tray was covered with an embroidered napkin, edged with silver fringe; and the cups, of the finest Chinese porcelain, rested upon silver stands.

" The Austrian officer, who spoke the Turkish language fluently, introduced me to the Pacha. The worthy Turk, upon learning that I was an Englishman, received me with the most marked courtesy; and when we had taken coffee and smoked our *tchibouques*, we related the object of our mission, to which he listened with the most polite attention. After deliberating a few minutes with his officers, he replied, that he had received instructions from his government not to permit any foreign vessel to pass down the Danube without a firman; 'but,' continued he, smiling, 'my orders do not include a mandate to fire, in case you choose to proceed on your own responsibility. In that event, however, I shall send an express to my superior officer, the Governor Pacha of Widdin.' We then made our congé and departed.

" Upon detailing the particulars of our interview to the remainder of the passengers, they with one consent announced their intention of quitting the boat. 'What!' said the well-trained Austrians, 'journey on in open defiance of established authority? Impossible. Suppose the Pacha should take it into his head, that sending a few bullets at ours was a duty incumbent upon him, are we to sacrifice our lives for a foolish firman? No. Proceed, captain, if you will; but we must, though very reluctantly, bid you adieu;' and they instantly quitted the vessel, leaving me not only to the enjoyment of a hearty laugh with the captain at their expense, but also the honour of being the first traveller who had

journeyed down the whole of the lower Danube in a steam-boat to the Black Sea."—vol. i. pp. 66-8.

This was a capital scene. We have here the experienced enterprise of England laughing at imaginary dangers; the obtuse obedience of Austria recoiling from a conflict with established authority, and Turkey hesitating between her waning ignorance, her natural benevolence, and her nascent hopes of a new era, the importance of which she does not as yet comprehend. As usual, victory crowns the cylinder,—and on it goes, smoking its way, to the astonishment, and doubtless to the admiration, even of those whom it left behind.

The Danube preserves almost throughout its course a striking uniformity, as well in its defects as in its perfections. Above Vienna as far as Ulm, where it begins to be navigable, we observe a strong family resemblance between its sudden windings, its numerous sand-banks, its rapids, its tranquil lakes, without any egress apparent to the navigator in the first instance, its division into minor streams, its expansion into floods that roll along in unrivalled grandeur, its sublime rocky boundaries, its marshy desolate shores, and those which are seen in the lower part of the river from Vienna to Galatz. The ruined fortress at Hayenbach, near the Austrian frontier, forms a promontory, round which the river, wheeling suddenly, enters a romantic defile, and returns so rapidly towards the preceding portion of its channel, that after the promontory is passed, the quadrangular tower of the ruin presents its northern side to the eye in apparently the same situation that it presented its southern side ten minutes before. A bend, exactly similar to this, though on a larger scale, takes place below Orsova, near the frontier of Wallachia, where it almost doubles on its previous course, retrograding towards Moldava, behind the mountains which stretch across the north-east angle of Servia.

The defile which the Danube enters after passing Hayenbach, is called by the peasantry of the district the "Schlagen." It is composed of numerous crags, piled one upon another, to the height of from three to four hundred fathoms, which almost close above the head of the voyager, and nearly shut out from him the daylight for a whole hour. Gorges exactly resembling this are penetrated by the river near Grein, in Upper Austria, near Durrenstein, where Richard Cœur de Lion was imprisoned, and at the Castle of Kolubatz, at a short distance below Moldava. The labyrinth of islands between Aschach and Ottensheim has its counterpart below Kubin; the sand-banks near Steyereck may be said to be repeated between Vienna and Presburg when the river is low; and the rapids called the "Strudel" and

“Wirbel,” not far from Grein, differ little from those which the Danube exhibits between Moldava and Swivich, and at the entrance of the celebrated Iron Door.

We know not whether we are to impute it to Mr. Spencer's good fortune, that by embarking on the Danube early in the month of April, 1836, when the river was swollen by the melting of the snows on the mountains, he was enabled to accomplish his voyage to the Black Sea without encountering any of the difficulties which Mr. Quin describes as the attendants of his expedition in the latter part of September 1834. There is, however, a pleasure in encountering and conquering the obstacles that occasionally interrupt one's journey, which none but a mind fond of adventure can appreciate. Besides, these breaks upon the smoother part of life throw a man upon his resources, and lead him into bye-scenes, and to an acquaintance with local peculiarities, which help him to make a full picture where the more speedy traveller can at the most only trace an outline. Mr. Spencer's account of the Danube is a very faint outline indeed. As to the author of *Austria and the Austrians*, (Mr. McGregor) his excursion on the river extended from Vienna to Silistria,—but he gives scarcely any details of his voyage. Between Mr. Quin's work and that of Mr. Spencer, the public, however, have at least some means of acquiring information relative to the steam navigation of that important stream. The former, beginning at Pesth and ending at Rutschuk, describes undoubtedly all that the banks of the Danube can boast of in the way of striking scenery,—and all that it had, and may in dry seasons again have, to present, in the shape of difficulties from shallows and sand-banks. The latter was borne on a full tide from Vienna to the Black Sea. From his production, travellers may learn what they have to expect from a voyage made in the early part of the season,—that is to say, almost as soon as the ice, which suspends the navigation of the Danube during winter, shall have broken up, and left the channel free from every species of impediment.

We consider it no trifling item in the consequences likely to arise from the opening of this mighty river to the enterprise of commercial nations, that it must inevitably arouse Austria from the political lethargy in which she has been prostrated since the destruction of Napoleon's empire. Since that epoch, the power of Russia has gone on increasing enormously every year; Prussia has, by active organization at home, and the diffusion of her commercial system over a great portion of Germany, acquired a station, and a degree of influence in Europe, which already places her by the side of Russia,—while the authority

formerly wielded by the house of Hapsburg, has been constantly on the decline. It is of great importance to the interests of England, that that authority should be restored,—and, if possible, enlarged. It has been remarked by many travellers who have recently visited Austria, that she alone of all other nations, Spain and Portugal excepted, presents no symptoms of that spirit of improvement, which is the great characteristic of the age. Some writers have gone still farther, and have administered to what we hope we may now call the fading prejudices of Englishmen against all Catholic countries, by representing Austria, and especially Vienna, as immersed in ignorance and superstition, and in vices of the most degrading character. Upon these latter points we have, from opportunities of personal observation, formed very different opinions, which Mr. M'Gregor, already favourably known to the public by his work on Canada, enables us to confirm to their fullest extent, although with an inconsistency which can scarcely be excused, he repeats, in several instances, the libels of the very writers whom his own evidence condemns.

If a court may be supposed to exercise any influence upon a nation, it must be admitted, we think, that there is no family seated on a throne whose morals are more pure, whose attention to all the duties of religion is more uniform and sincere, than that of the reigning family of Austria.

“ Among themselves, the imperial family live as if they were private citizens. The empress drives out in her chariot with a lady companion, both very plainly but very neatly attired. The few persons who happen to be promenading at the time on the terrace of the garden, usually walk quietly up to the unshowy palace door, when they see the imperial carriage drive up, to have a look, within a few feet, of one or both of their majesties, who go daily unattended by guards, and neither by night nor day ever entertain the idea of being injured.

“ The court gaieties are almost limited to a few formal balls and receptions during the Carnival; and for society, the imperial family limit themselves chiefly to the domestic circles of its numerous members, who live with each other in the most affectionate harmony. They are strictly Catholics in their devotions. The late emperor enjoined this by precept and by example. If there be but one virtuous court on earth, that court is assuredly found at Vienna; and if the character of a court give at all times a tone to public manners, those of Austria must be considered chaste, unostentatious, unexpensive, and strictly domestic.

* * * * *

“ At Vienna, and wherever the court resides, every member of it assiduously promotes public and private benevolence; and, although they usually shun the gayer pleasures, they are, I am told, scarcely ever

phisticated imagination few popular spectacles can be more interesting than those which we have witnessed in Italy and Spain, consisting of periodical processions to favourite shrines and fountains. We apprehend that in casting up the accounts of crime, they would be found infinitely less productive of evil than those assemblages called "Revivals of Religious Fervor," in England and the United States, or the "Holy Fairs," and "Camp Meetings," in Scotland.

With respect to the ignorance in which the Austrians are represented to be universally involved, let the reader judge, when he learns the fact, that by law no village in the hereditary dominions can be without an elementary school—that no male can enter the marriage state who is not able to read, write, and keep accounts—that no master of any trade can, without paying a heavy penalty, employ workmen who are unable to read and write, and that small books of a moral tendency are in constant course of publication and distribution at the lowest possible price to all the Emperor's subjects. "I have nowhere in Austria met any one under thirty years of age who was not able to read and write," says Mr. M'Gregor, who, by the way, more than once informs us that he is strongly opposed to what he calls the "political constitution" of the Catholic church. The same author states, from returns which he says he obtained without any difficulty, that there are in Austria, Bohemia, Galicia, Moravia, the Tyrol, Styria, and the Italian provinces, eight universities, in which eight hundred and seventy-three professors afford instruction in every branch of education to twenty-two thousand students; that there are in the Austrian dominions, exclusive of Hungary and Transylvania, 25,121 national elementary schools, superintended by 10,280 ecclesiastical, and 22,082 lay teachers, and that in these schools 2,313,420 children are instructed in reading, writing, and arithmetic. Taking the population of the states in question at 22,500,000, there is consequently, at the least, one in ten of the whole population receiving instruction. This statement does not include the numbers educated in the lyceums, academies, and private schools, which may be said to abound throughout the states above mentioned. Education has not been neglected in Hungary* or Transylvania; and through the exertions

* The University of Pesth has a revenue of about £60,000 per annum; it maintains, gratuitously, a great number of indigent scholars, and upwards of one thousand candidates for the priesthood. "There is no distinction as to *creeds* observed in regard to admission: In 1835, the pupils were 1172 Catholics, 253 Protestants, 261 Jews, 84 Greeks—in all 1770; besides maintaining a preparatory ecclesiastical seminary, an archigymnasium of six classes; and about 3,600 district

of the patriotic noblemen whose influence is working important reforms in both those countries, we doubt not that they will soon emulate Austria in the number of their institutions for the instruction of the people. It ill becomes an Englishman to say one word about the "ignorance" of the Austrians, when he looks at home, and sees a dominant establishment monopolizing the advantages of the two Universities, and no provision as yet made for the education of the lower orders at all comparable to the system which has long prevailed in the Austrian dominions.

The greatest difficulty against which Austria has to contend in the new career opened to her by the steam-navigation of the Danube, is the very unsatisfactory state of her revenue, presenting annually a serious deficit, which sooner or later must be provided for by fresh loans. There is no question that this deficit is the result of a code of laws founded upon the very worst views of commercial policy. For the sake of affording protection to a limited class of domestic manufactures, almost all foreign commodities are prohibited in Austria, or burthened with duties equivalent to exclusion. The advantages which the steam-navigation of the Danube is capable of conferring upon the Austrian dominions are incalculable; but, in fact, that river must be considered upon a still grander scale, as a great artery, flowing from west to east through the most important parallels of central Europe. A few canals and rail-roads of no great extent, some of which are already in progress, if not completed, will connect it with the Rhine, the Main, and the Elbe, and innumerable tributary streams, navigable, or capable of being rendered navigable throughout a great part of their respective channels, will afford inlets from it to a great number of populous towns, and tracts of country naturally rich in all kinds of produce.

The starting of a steam-boat from Vienna is a novelty which the Danube seldom allows the inhabitants of that capital to witness, as the river becomes so shallow in summer that no vessel, even of moderate burthen, can come higher up than Presburg. This inconvenience, however, is about to be remedied. Works are in progress for deepening the bed of the river, and a canal is in course of excavation, with a view to unite the capital with the great navigable arm of the Danube, distant about a league. Mr. Spencer's boat was called the *Nador*; he found on board of it

grammar and elementary schoolmasters, are aided or supported from the funds of this University."—*Austria and the Austrians*, vol. ii. p. 229. Hear this, Oxford and Cambridge!!

(April 5, 1836) from two to three hundred persons. He complains of the accommodations—very much inferior to those of the Rhenish steam-vessels—and also with equal justice of the charges for refreshment, which are extravagant, compared with the usual prices of provisions in that part of the continent. But the fares were moderate—about a pound sterling from Vienna to Pesth, for the principal cabin. His companions were, belles and beaux from Vienna, on a voyage of experiment as to the pleasure of travelling by steam, Hungarians on their way to the races, and motley tribes of Tyroleans, Styrians, Moravians, Poles, Bohemians, and Jews, on their way to the great fair, then about to be held at Pesth. The fuel used in the furnace was chiefly wood; although an abundance of coal may be found in Hungary, the enterprise is still wanted which can render it available to the uses of the steam-engine.

Within the duchy of Austria the landscape was dreary and monotonous, except where it was now and then relieved by distant prospects of the Kahlenberg and Hungarian hills. The approach to the Hungarian frontier presented scenes more picturesque,—ruined castles, dilapidated fortifications, neat towns, pretty villages, vine-clad hills, rich corn fields, and blooming gardens. Petronell, the Carnuntum of the Romans, still preserves remains of the triumphal arch erected by Augustus to Tiberius, as conqueror of Pannonia; and also some traces of the celebrated wall, which extends thence to the great Hungarian lake, Neusiedlersee,—a gigantic work, supposed to have been originally constructed by the Germans as a defence against the Huns, Tartars, and other Asiatic tribes. It served also in the Turkish wars as a serious obstacle to the followers of the Prophet, in their inroads upon Austria.

Mr. Spencer is quite right in his observation, that the tour of the Danube should be made in Spring,—not, however, as he says, because the voyager is not then liable to be tormented by mosquitoes, for he soon found the contrary to be the fact, but because

“ Nature is then dressed in her brightest smiles; and, as she now appeared, I could not too much admire the delicately rich verdure of the pastures and meadows, the gardens and orchards, clothed in all their varied flowery tints, resembling so many bouquets; while the young corn, here waving in the wind, there bursting from its earthly prison in all the vigour of renewed life, gave an additional charm to the beautiful landscape.”—vol. i. p. 9.

Nothing can be more dull than the banks of the Danube from Presburg to Pesth. The latter, the real capital of Hungary, has been every day rising in importance since the establishment of steam navigation, and promises before long to eclipse Vienna

itself. Mr. Spencer had the good fortune to meet there the Count (Stephen) Schechenyi, the distinguished patrician, the sage and persevering patriot, to whose exertions the introduction of steam upon the Danube is mainly, if not solely, attributable. The great improvements which have recently taken place in the society and architectural decoration of Pesth, are, in a great measure, to be ascribed to the same public-spirited and enlightened family.

Let not the traveller, while sojourning at Pesth, forget to make an excursion to the lake Balaton, and the mineral bath Fured, at a short distance from that capital. Wonderfully few calls upon his purse, pleasant social assemblies, a theatre, rural undulating environs, charming prospects over land and water, a happy climate, a beauteous village and monastery, surrounded by a chain of rocks, and perched on an island in the middle of the lake, can hardly fail to keep his mind in a state of cheerfulness for a few days. Within the fairy island are caverns, which the monks of the middle ages constructed, in order to protect themselves and their property against the devastations of the Turks. The monastery is still in the possession of their religious descendants. The lake (twenty leagues in length) is worth a visit from the stranger, were it only to afford him the opportunity of feasting upon that most "rare and delicious" fish, called by the most horrid of all names—the *fogas*! The lake, though usually clear as crystal, is said to have the magical faculty of announcing the approach of a storm, by becoming turbid. We say nothing of the "petrified hoofs" of horses which are related to be thrown up occasionally from the bosom of those waters, lest we might incur the charge of *superstition*.

The Directors of the Steam Navigation Company having resolved to despatch the *Pannonia*, a flat-bottomed boat, of thirty-six-horse power, down to Galatz, for the purpose of ascertaining how far it was practicable, from the great height the water had attained, to cross the cataracts of the Iron Door, Mr. Spencer took the opportunity, as might be collected from what we have already said, of becoming one of her passengers. The accommodations were luxurious: a lady's cabin, and a large saloon furnished with divans; the whole remarkably clean. But there being "no regular berths, the sofas performed the duties of beds!" A very good substitute too, we should have thought. Commend us to a sofa for a bed any where, much less on board a Danubian steamer. Has Mr. Spencer never roughed it *sub Jove* on a coil of rope? He was much "inconvenienced" also while performing his "toilet;" that is to say, probably, there was only one washhand basin on board,—the said basin being,

perhaps, a pie-dish ! His fate was lamentable, it must be confessed, though we would venture to affirm, that his Hungarian companions, amongst whom he mentions the excellent and venerable Count Francis Esterhazy, were happy all the day long, without having thought of any toilet at all.

Our voyager hurries on from Pesth to Peterwardein,—and so rapidly, that, like his boat, he scarcely leaves a trace behind him. He then enters one of the most stupendous gorges along the whole line of the Danube, the description of which he despatches in two lines,—preferring, it would seem, to bestow his attention upon the bath of Mehadia, at the distance of a few leagues from Orsova, which he had already visited some years ago. We give his account of it, as it may tempt some of our rheumatic, gouty, or consumptive readers, to make experiment of its power, and so discover a good excuse for a trip down the Danube.

“ This pretty bath, which I visited some years since, has become, partly in consequence of the steam navigation on the Danube, (from whence it is only distant a few leagues,) and partly from the inherent efficacy of the waters, extremely popular. They were known to the Romans, who called them—from the high temperature of the water, exceeding forty-seven degrees of Reaumur, and also probably from the copiousness of the supply exceeding that of any other in Europe, ‘ *Thermæ Herculis ad aquas.*’

“ There are twenty-two springs, nine of which are at present in use ; and if we may believe the accounts of their healing powers, they effect a cure in most chronic cases of scrofula, cutaneous diseases, rheumatism, gout, contractions of the limbs, consumption of the lungs, diseases of the eyes, &c. Nor do their sanative qualities constitute the only attraction of these baths, for the surrounding country is beautiful, abounding with romantic valleys and lofty hills. In addition to this the climate is so mild, that we find the fig, and other trees peculiar to southern climes, growing wild in the woods ; and at the same time so genial, that the most delicate invalid may remain exposed to the air until a very late hour in the evening. Promenades are laid out with shady alleys in the vicinity, and several fine hotels have been recently constructed and fitted up with every accommodation for the visitors, who may here indulge in all the moderate luxuries of life for about a dollar a-day !”—vol. i. p. 65-6.

It was at Orsova that the Turkish threat of interruption took place, which we have already noticed. The *Pannonia* then proceeded to the Iron Door, through which, in consequence of the height the river had attained, she passed without the slightest difficulty, being unquestionably the first steam-vessel that had accomplished this somewhat perilous feat.

“ Here the majestic river, pent up in a narrow channel, rushes between stupendous rocks down the descent with the rapidity of lightning, and

with a crash so tremendous, as to overpower every other sound ; while the foaming surge, as it broke with violence over the deck, and lashed the sides of our vessel, gave to the river the appearance of the sea when agitated by a storm. Nor was this all ; for before our arrival at the cataract, we had to pass through a continuation of whirlpools and inconsiderable waterfalls, which, though not dangerous, added very much to the romantic character of our voyage.”—vol. i. 69-70.

This, it must be avowed, is but a scanty description of the most “magnificent horror” on the Danube. Our voyager affords us no temptation to delay with him until he arrives at Silistria, where the Danube becomes so broad, that to those who coast the Bulgarian side, the Wallachian shore is scarcely visible. The banks now became only a continued series of marshes, fertile, to an awful degree, of mosquitoes, sand-flies, and hornets, who, sometimes alternately, sometimes *en masse*, attacked the unfortunate passengers. At night, the plagues were most numerous, and most tormenting. They entered the cabin in such clouds, as to extinguish all the lights. Their appetite for blood is insatiable. Woe ! to the untanned European who ventures beyond Silistria without a mosquito net, for if he escape from their assaults, and the chorus of their hum, to which the weeping of Pandemonium is melody itself, by taking refuge on the deck, it is but passing from Scylla to Charybdis, for there he will probably catch the intermittent fever, another offspring of the swamps.

Such was the rapidity of the current beyond Silistria, that even without the assistance of the engine, the steamer was borne onward with astonishing velocity to Hirsova, formerly a fortified town, constructed on a series of rocky eminences, which, in the last war, resisted the siege of the Russians for two months. It is now in ruins, the few habitations which are found there consisting entirely of mud. The rock on which the citadel stood, affords an extensive prospect over the vast plains of Wallachia and Bulgaria, to the chain of the Balkans,—plains, blessed with a fine climate and a fertile soil, which industry might enrich with every species of useful produce, but which is now a wilderness. Pelicans and eagles are seen here in great abundance. Braila, the next port visited by the *Pannonia*, is a commercial town of considerable importance in Wallachia. It has been recently resorted to by several English vessels. At a short distance beyond it is Galatz, in Moldavia,—a town, which though chiefly consisting of mud houses, contains upwards of twenty thousand inhabitants, and has been rising rapidly in importance since the establishment of steam-boats on the Danube.

Before that epoch, as we may justly style it, Galatz exhibited a picture of wretchedness. But Mr. Spencer mentions signs of improvement,—which, though few, it is delightful to contemplate: an air of animation in the port—pretty villas rising on the heights—some eight or ten mercantile vessels, chiefly British, lying in the river—and *two* Austrian steamers, one of which, the “*Ferdinando Primo*,” trades between Galatz and Constantinople.

“In wandering through the town, I was more pleased with the aspect of the inhabitants than of their dwellings, as they formed a variety of groupes at once picturesque and interesting. In one place, under the verandah of a coffee-house, sat a crowd of Turks, languidly smoking the *tchibouque*: in another were to be seen, sauntering along the beach, a long range of most primitive-looking carriages, driven by Jews, Turks, Greeks or Moldavians, in their respective costumes, and attended by bare-legged footmen. Here the awkward military were attempting to perform their European evolutions; and a stranger, on observing them, might deem they were afraid of gunpowder, as they never fired a salute without first making the sign of the cross on their foreheads. There Jews, in their long vestments and high fur caps, were selling their flimsy wares at a profit of cent. per cent., to the crew of an English vessel just released from quarantine; and, to complete the picture, hundreds of men and boys were breasting the silvery current of the river, unencumbered with the superfluity of bathing dresses, beneath the eyes of numbers of fair ladies, who nevertheless seemed to regard the matter with the most perfect nonchalance.”—vol. i. 84-5.

Mr. Spencer embarked on board the *Ferdinando* for Constantinople. Below Ismael, in the palmy days of Ottoman ascendancy one of the most beautiful and commercial towns in the empire, but now scarcely entitled to a dot on the map, commences the Delta of the Danube—a vast sea, thickly studded with swampy islands covered with bulrushes—the very type of extreme desolation. Among these islands, the river divides itself into various arms,—some say seven,—some six—five—four. The principal is the Suline, which mariners generally use,—and the central line of which, according to the treaty of Adrianople, divides the Russian from the Turkish dominions. Along this arm the *Ferdinando* was hurried with amazing velocity into the Euxine; the river still preserving its yellow turbid character for an immense distance, as it rolled through the clear dark-blue waters of the sea. It happened that at the moment a thunder-storm came on: the waves rose in mountains—the tempest drove the steamer, like a feather, through the surge—but she rode gallantly through, and, in a short time, reached Varna. The following morning her voyage to Stamboul was accomplished. Mr. Spencer states, that exclusive of table charges, which are

rather high, the sum of eleven pounds sterling would cover the whole of his expenses from Vienna to Constantinople; and that casting anchor each night at sunset, the tourist might perform the voyage, from one capital to the other, with the greatest ease, in eight days. In the still imperfect state of things, he may, however, allow four days more for accidents.

The British trade to the Danube is as yet confined to sailing vessels, which proceed no higher than Galatz and Braila. Such is the force of the current, that no wind can contend against it; and it therefore becomes necessary to employ a considerable number of men to drag the vessels to their destination. The shore, unfortunately, is so marshy, and, where it ceases to be a swamp, so rocky, that the labour of these men is tremendous. The Russian authorities afford little encouragement to our enterprise in that quarter; indeed, at first, they attempted, under the various pretexts of tolls and quarantine laws, to exclude us altogether from the Danube. But, a well-timed and vigorous remonstrance from Lord Palmerston, has put an end to those manœuvres. Still the upward navigation of the Danube, especially through the embouchures, must be attended with many difficulties, which steam-power alone can overcome. It is certainly possible to cut a canal, or rather as some say, to re-open an old arm of the Danube, now filled up with sand, which, in ancient times, connected that river with the Euxine at Kustendji. The map shews, a little below Silistria, the lake of Rassova, extending thirteen miles in length, communicating with the Danube. From the eastern extremity of that lake to the coast of the Black Sea, the direct distance does not appear to be quite twenty miles—a distance not to be compared to that through which the Dutch have cut from Amsterdam to the Helder, for their frigates and East India ships, merely to avoid the intricacies of the Zuyderzee. Such a canal, if executed upon an adequate scale, would be attended with great advantages. To the merchant proceeding from the Bosphorus, it would shorten the way into the Danube by more than two hundred miles; it would give him solid towing-ground, and would save him altogether from the necessity of passing near the frontiers of Russia. He might go up to Georgeva, or even to Gladova, with ease,—or descend to Braila and Galatz, with still more facility. That this great work will be achieved one day, we entertain little doubt; but that day must be still distant, unless the undertaking be confided to British enterprise, capital, and skill. The natural riches of Moldavia, Wallachia, Servia, and Hungary, not to go farther, would alone justify such a labour, and even repay it, “beyond the dreams of avarice.”

The progress lately made in opening the trade of the Danube, which, however, has not yet, from several causes, been so profitable as some of the more ardent adventurers expected, appears to have directed attention very generally also to the coasts of the Black Sea. Our commercial intercourse with that region had been long confined chiefly to Odessa, which from being an inconsiderable Târtar village in 1792, has become a maritime city, containing nearly sixty thousand inhabitants, many private mansions and public buildings, erected in a style of splendour, and numerous bazaars, stored with the productions of Asia and Europe. Odessa, however, although a free port, labours under serious disadvantages. The town is ill supplied with water, that found in the wells being brackish: the country behind it, to a vast distance, is an elevated plain, destitute of wood for fuel; the winter, which endures full six months, is necessarily severe, in a climate exposed to the unmitigated violence of the north-easterly winds; the bay is annually frozen from December to February, thus presenting a material hindrance to commerce: in consequence of its contiguity to Turkey, every vessel that arrives is obliged to submit to a quarantine of fourteen days, a great loss of time to the mariner and merchant, and the bay, or rather roadstead, is so exposed, that no autumn or spring passes without recording the wrecks of numerous traders. These inconveniences and dangers, added to the expensive formalities of the Russian government respecting passports, the port regulations, and the heavy, almost prohibitive, duties imposed upon foreign manufactures, limit the commerce of Odessa chiefly to exportation, and have constantly operated as a check upon its growth as a place of first-rate commercial character. Whenever favourable harvests in the southern provinces of Russia happen to be contemporary with deficient harvests in England and the south of Europe, then Odessa seems a Liverpool. But when those temporary causes of activity pass away, Odessa subsides to a maritime town of less than secondary rank in the scale.

Hence Constantinople and Trebizond have been lately much resorted to by our merchantmen; and inquiries have been prosecuted along the coasts of Circassia, with a degree of vigour which promises eventually results eminently beneficial. It is true, that the capture and confiscation of the *Vixen*, may, for a season, discourage enterprise on the Circassian coast; but the correspondence laid by Lord Palmerston on the table of the House of Commons, since the publication of our last number, shows that there is nothing in those proceedings calculated to interfere with the lawful right of British subjects to carry on their trade in that quarter.

From the correspondence to which we allude, it appears that in the year 1831, the Russian government issued a regulation, duly notified to all the powers, by which foreign seamen who might desire to visit the *eastern* coast of the Black Sea, were prohibited from touching at any other points than those at which quarantine establishments and custom houses were situated, viz., Anapa, a little to the south of the Kuban river, in Circassia, and Redoute-Kalé, upon the Kopi, in Mingrelia. The late firm of Messrs. George Bell and Co., being aware of this regulation, undertook to try its legality at their own risk. They accordingly chartered the *Vixen*, of London, and having shipped on board a cargo of salt, the vessel, under the direction of Mr. James Bell, sailed for the coast of Circassia, and arrived on the 24th of November last, at Soudjuk-Kalé, thirty miles to the south-east of Anapa. The *Vixen* was, within thirty-six hours after, while in the act of trading with the inhabitants, captured there by a Russian brig of war, taken to Sevastopol, confiscated, together with her cargo, and declared good prize. Soudjuk-Kalé has neither custom-house nor quarantine establishment. Salt is an article the importation of which into all the Russian ports of the Black Sea, and of the sea of Azoph, is expressly prohibited by the Russian tariff. If Soudjuk-Kalé, therefore, on the 24th of November last, was a Russian port, the *Vixen* was clearly liable to confiscation as a smuggler; and the supercargo, captain, and crew were subject to serious penalties for violating the quarantine laws.

The question depends, consequently, on the national character of Soudjuk-Kalé at the time specified. By Article IV of the treaty of Adrianople, between Russia and the Porte, the coast of the Black Sea, from the mouth of the Kuban to the harbour of St. Nicholas, inclusive (embracing, in fact, the whole eastern coast), was placed, in 1829, under the dominion of the Czar. Custom-houses and quarantine stations were soon after established at Anapa and Redoute-Kalé; and both those ports were then opened to the *regular* trade of all nations. It appears, moreover, that there is a fortress in the bay of Soudjuk-Kalé, which was, at the time, *de facto* occupied by a Russian garrison. In the treaty of 1783, between Russia and the Porte, Soudjuk-Kalé was acknowledged as a Turkish possession. It was ceded to Russia by the Porte in 1829; and, when the *Vixen* arrived there, was occupied by Russian soldiers. The *Vixen* was, moreover, laden with an unlawful cargo. Her confiscation, therefore, was in every way justifiable; and the supercargo, captain, and crew, may think themselves fortunate in not having been visited, as by law they might have been, with the penalties attendant

upon the violation of quarantine; especially when it is remembered that more than half the inhabitants of Odessa, were, on one occasion, swept off by a pestilence imported from Constantinople.

On the other hand, it is said, that previous to the last war with Turkey, the Czar issued a manifesto disclaiming any views of fresh territorial acquisitions; that Soudjuk-Kalé was never a Turkish possession, and, in November last, was not a Russian possession, because the Circassians, upon whose coast it is situated, have never yet been conquered by either of those powers. The answer given to this is, that in 1783, the port in question was recognized by Russia to be under the authority of Turkey, and that Turkey, in 1829, ceded that authority to Russia. If the Circassians deny the legality of the recognition in one case, or of the cession in the other, there is the *fact* of possession still to be disputed,—to be disputed only by arms; to be overturned only by success. No foreign power is of necessity called upon to decide that question. As to the manifesto of the Czar, by not adhering to it, he unquestionably brought a stain upon his government. It will be a good reason for not trusting again to Russian documents of that description; but it is for England, at least, no adequate cause of war.

A very beautiful declaration of "Independence" was published for the Circassians some time ago in the *Portfolio*, a journal whose sole object is the propagation of every kind of intelligence, whether authentic or apocryphal, which might tend to inflame public opinion in this country against Russia. Unfortunately, Messrs. Bell and Co. appear to have acted upon the supposition that a declaration of that kind is equivalent to independence itself. They perhaps considered the document as one not altogether unapproved by the precautionary policy of the British government; and in that view they took it upon themselves to precipitate questions into the arena which are as yet unripe for discussion.

The interest, however, which the struggles of the Circassian tribes against the oppressive rule of the Czar, has excited lately in this country, is manifestly on the increase. Several travellers have visited their mountains, and favoured us with accounts of their military ardour and gallantry, their national customs, and the scenery of their territory, which have been well received. The narrative of M. de Marigny would have been deemed valuable, had it not been superseded by the more recent and more ample details furnished by Mr. Spencer. The attempt to impart to the former peculiar importance, by announcements that the suppressions in the Russian edition are restored, and that

the interpolations of the Muscovite censor are exhibited in the translation now before us, is not likely to extend its popularity. In fact, the passages eliminated and added are scarcely worth notice. We shall, as we go along, in our visit to the Circassians, receive from M. de Marigny all the assistance his observations can lend us; but Mr. Spencer must be our principal cicerone.

In consequence of the whole of the Circassian coast being strictly watched by Russian ships of war, our traveller found a voyage thither an affair of no small difficulty. Assuming the character of a Genoese doctor, lest, if he preserved his English name and appearance, he might be taken to be a political agent (the Genoese having, some centuries ago, carried on an intercourse with the Circassians, still favourably remembered by the latter), he engaged a passage on board a Turkish brigantine (a smuggler) bound for Pchad, a small port to the south-east of Soudjuk-Kalé. The cargo consisted of ammunition and salt. They were fortunate enough to reach their destination without interruption. The Russians held military possession of Pchad for some time; but they were expelled from it by the Circassians, who destroyed their magazines. Equipped as a Circassian warrior, mounted upon a splendid horse which cost 4*l.* (in England, he says, it would have cost 100*l.*) and accompanied by the captain of the brigantine, Mr. Spencer set out for the residence of the chief of the district, Indar Oglou. They were followed by a numerous train of the natives, whose appearance our author describes in animated language.

“The inhabitants of this part of the Caucasus, after the establishment of the Ottoman power on the Black Sea, having been, in consequence of Turkish jealousy and their constant wars, excluded for ages from holding any communication with the more civilized natives of Europe, particularly their old friends, the Genoese, now present the singular anomaly of a people retaining a great deal of the chivalrous customs and manners that distinguished the warriors of the middle ages, in conjunction with those of the Orient, and their own natural simplicity as mountaineers. In vain I sought among the crowd the eye of some chief, some superior, whose presence held in check the fierce warriors around me; but none such could I discover: they all seemed of the same family, the same rank; and yet, with the exception of their boisterous mirth, the loud screaming of the war-cry, and singing of warlike songs, they could not be exceeded for orderly behaviour by any other body of men, even in the best disciplined country of the most despotic power in Europe.

“I was first struck with their fine martial appearance, athletic forms, regular features, and the proud consciousness of freedom displayed in every glance and movement. The most accomplished cavalier in Europe could not sit his horse with greater ease and grace than did these wild

mountaineers ; and the symmetry of the noble animals that carried them I have never seen equalled, except in our own country. All this ill accorded with the poverty of their habiliments and accoutrements ; but, whether they were habited in hemp, linen, the coarsest baize, or even sheep's-skin, I was compelled to admire the sensible shape of their vestments, and their admirable adaptation either to display the symmetry of the form, a defence against the weather, or an appropriate military costume : and yet this has been the attire of this singular people from time immemorial,—a people whom we have been accustomed to regard as barbarians, but whose dress and system of warfare are now adopted, to improve those of the Russian army.

“ The usual dress of a Circassian warrior of all classes is a tunic resembling a military Polonaise, without a collar, closely fitted to the body, and descending to the knee, secured around the middle by a leather girdle, ornamented, according to the wealth or fancy of the wearer with gold or silver, in which are stuck a pair of pistols and a poniard. The latter is a most formidable weapon in close combat. During an attack, they hold it in their left hand, and, from its breadth and length, reaching to the elbow, it serves every purpose of a shield.

“ In addition to this, the Circassian is armed with a light gun, slung across the shoulder, and a sabre suspended by a silk cord in the Turkish fashion ; attached to the belt is a powder-flask, and a small metal box containing flints, steel, gun-screws, oil, and, not unfrequently, a small hatchet. Hence, a Circassian, whether on foot or on horseback, is at all times completely armed. Sometimes he carries a javelin, which he uses with singular dexterity and effect, hurling it to a considerable distance with an aim that never errs. The latter weapon is also used as a rest for the rifle, having a groove at the top expressly for that purpose. Bows and arrows are now very seldom used, except in cases where it is necessary to arm the whole population.

“ On either side of the breast of the coat are the patron pockets, made of morocco leather, usually containing twenty-four rounds of ball cartridge. These not only add to the military appearance of the soldier, but in some measure protect the breast, and are extremely convenient. A round fur cap, with a crown the same colour as the ammunition pocket, is the covering for the head ; and cloth trousers, in the eastern fashion, complete the costume. Princes and nobles are alone entitled to the privilege of wearing red ; and the Circassians, like the natives of most other eastern countries, shave the head, and are never seen barefoot. When marching, or on a journey, they always add a cloak made from camel or goat's hair, with a hood, which completely envelopes the whole person ; this is called a *tchaouka*, and no Mackintosh was ever more impenetrable to the rain : rolled up in its thick folds, it forms the only bed during their encampments, and serves, besides, to protect them against the scorching rays of the sun.”—vol. ii. p. 216-219.

The scenery through which the strangers passed was Swiss in its character : valleys watered by crystal streams ; cottages clustered on their banks, or suspended on the eminences above ;

rich pastures, trodden by numerous herds of cattle; and fields undergoing the usual routine of cultivation. "I was not a little amused," says Mr. Spencer, "to see the men and boys at work in the fields, on perceiving our party, desert their labours, fly to their cottages, arm themselves, and mount their horses, in order to swell our ranks." Proceeding over mountains, through dense forests, romantic glens, open plains, and dark ravines, for the most part, however, diligently cultivated, our doctor would have thought himself, from the non-appearance of habitations, still far from the place of which he was in search, had he not been informed, that, in fact, the various territory through which he passed was thickly inhabited, the Circassians having the habit of concealing their dwellings by dense foliage, in order to elude hostile observation. On his journey he was further told, that Indar Oglou was absent with his sons at a meeting of "the confederate princes," but that he might count upon being well received at the residence of a chief of the second class.

"Here my host of companions left me, apparently much pleased; for their shouts of 'vo-ri, ra, ka' redounded from hill to hill, from rock to rock. Thus, I had every reason to feel grateful for my reception, and satisfied with the friendly disposition evinced by the inhabitants towards me. We were ushered into the apartment reserved for the reception of strangers, where the squire of my host divested me of all my arms, except the poniard, and hung them up on the walls of the rooms, already adorned with a vast number, consisting of guns, pistols, sabres, poniards, bows, and arrows, and one or two coats of mail, all kept in the highest order, and several richly ornamented with gold, silver, and precious stones.

"The room differed little in its appointments from those of the Turks. The floor was covered with a brilliantly-coloured carpet; a divan of red leather, stuffed with hair, surrounded the chamber; and several small tablets, inscribed with verses of the Koran, in the Arabic language, were affixed to the walls. From this circumstance, I inferred that my host professed the Mahometan religion, which induced me to present him my firman, when, like a true believer, he kissed it most reverently, evidently regarding me with high respect, as the possessor of a document so sacred as to have affixed to it the seal of the spiritual chief of all the Osmanlis. However, his acquaintance with the Turkish language was merely confined to a few phrases, and his knowledge of Islamism vague and imperfect.

"Our refreshment was served in the Turkish style, consisting of a variety of dishes, separately brought in, upon small round tables about half a foot high. There could not have been less than from twelve to fifteen. Many would have been much better, had they been less seasoned. They were principally made from poultry, mutton, milk, honey, and fruits, with pastry. But all my entreaties were unavailing to induce our host to share the repast with us, who, according to the

custom of this people, remained in the room the whole of the time, in the most courteous manner, anticipating every wish.

“During the repast, we were waited upon, in addition to our host, by several female slaves. The drink was a species of mead, and the boza of the Tartars, made from millet, in taste not unlike small beer. The bread was a composition of wheat and maize of excellent flavour; and, in the pilaff, which was not to be despised, buck-wheat formed a very good substitute for rice. Of course, we had a pewter tray for a table-cloth, wooden bowls for glasses, poniards for carving knives, fingers for forks, and the palms of our hands for spoons; but all these inconveniences, common to the East, were to me but as a feather in the balance, compared with being obliged to sit for an hour on a carpet, cross-legged; and, I assure you, I felt not a little pleasure, when the ceremony was over, to take a ramble through the grounds.

“The clustered dwellings of my host, which might be said to resemble a little hamlet, were pleasantly situated on a rising eminence sloping down to the banks of a rivulet; and, being surrounded by grounds, divided, with no little judgment, into gardens, orchards, paddocks, meadows, and corn-fields, animated, here and there, with flocks of sheep and herds of cattle, altogether formed a very pretty picture. I could not but admire the judicious arrangement of the granary, supported on short stone pillars, each having attached, a few feet from the ground, a broad circular stone, hollowed in the centre, by means of which it effectually preserves the grain not only from dampness, but from the attack of any vermin whatsoever.”—vol. ii. p. 223-226.

M. de Marigny is fond of discovering traits of resemblance between the manners of the Circassians and those of the ancient Greeks, assuming the latter to be accurately described in that most picturesque and beautiful of all *Tours*, the *Odyssey*. The fact is, that the scenes and customs painted in that immortal work are not peculiar to the old Greek nations. They will be found to prevail generally in those tracts of country which include Asia Minor, the borders of the Black Sea, the Hellespont, the Bosphorus, and the Danube. It must, however, be admitted, that the Circassians of the present day remind us more of that pleasing rusticity, that becoming pride, that chastened barbarism, those tableaux of classic forms and patriarchal hospitality, which characterize the age of Agamemnon, than do even the regions once traversed by Ulysses. The following description of the petty chieftain's household is, in many respects, Odyssean:—

“During our rambles through the grounds, we found the wives and children of my host, with their slaves, employed at agricultural pursuits, or tending their flocks and herds. Some were engaged in reaping, others in milking the cows; and one fine-looking princess, with the force of an Amazon, was repairing a wooden fence with a hatchet. Among the children, there was a remarkably good-looking, curly-headed boy, and

a girl, about eight or nine years of age, who seemed, in an especial degree, to possess the affection of the father. I was just in the act of extolling the beauty of the children, when I was fortunately checked in time by the captain; for though, in Europe, you win the heart of a parent by praising his offspring, yet here, for the same compliment, you are accused of intending to extend over them the malign influence of the evil eye.

"The young urchins were not inappropriately named the 'Look of a Lion,' and the 'Speed of a Deer;' for the one was playing with the half-wild horses as if they were kittens, while the fair young princess displayed the utmost agility in driving her refractory charge of goats, cows, and buffaloes, to water.

"The women of Circassia are not, as in other parts of the East, completely confined to the harem, nor are they altogether obliged to conceal their features with the veil from the observation of the stranger, that article of dress being worn more as a shelter from the sun, when taking the air, and, in-doors, as a graceful form of head-dress. The wives of my host were habited in a species of white garment, made from camel or goat's hair, which enveloped the whole form. To this was added a muslin veil; and you cannot think how picturesque was the effect when viewed from a distance. The *sanctum sanctorum*, in which were lodged the women and children, in addition to being enclosed within a wooden fence, was completely concealed from view by the thick foliage of groves of trees. Here are also the sheds for the cattle; the remainder of the cots being either set apart for the reception of strangers, or inhabited by the dependents of the chief. There might have been altogether about six or seven; the whole built of hurdles, plastered inside and out, and neatly thatched with reeds and Indian corn leaves. Each cot contained two rooms; the one, with a large fireplace in the centre, appropriated to cooking and domestic purposes, somewhat resembled that of an old English farm house, having pot-hooks and hangers; while the other answered the double purpose of a sitting-room and dormitory. A chequered mat, of variegated colours, covered the floor; and a divan surrounded three sides of the room: the only additional furniture being a few small tables, about a foot in height, and something resembling a chest of drawers; unless, indeed, we include the saddles, bridles, housings, and weapons, that hung suspended against the walls.

"Those occupied by the ladies of the chieftain and their slaves, were furnished in a similar manner; the only additional decoration, I presume by way of ornament, were shelves loaded with glass, china, and bright culinary utensils, made of brass, copper, or glazed pottery, intended more for show than use. There was also a grand display, hanging upon lines across the room, of the various specimens of female industry, such as embroidered napkins, handkerchiefs, veils, and costly dresses, glittering with gold and silver. In one corner was a heap of mattresses, and in another, pillows and coverlets covered with a gay muslin quilt of various colours, but most studiously arranged, so as to shew the ends of each, which were decked with satin, sprigged with gold and silver; and it is

but justice to the fair dames to say, that every thing was kept remarkably clean and neat.

"Of every part of the dwelling, of this primitive people, the little verandah, in fine weather, is the greatest favourite; this is generally furnished with a mat and a bench for a divan. Here the visitor is regaled; here the improvisatore chants the warlike songs of his nation; the story-teller relates the traditionary tale."—vol. ii. p. 226-9.

Mountains are always the favourite abodes, the best fortresses of liberty; and in no country are those fortresses so numerous and so impregnable as in Circassia. It is, moreover, a favourable peculiarity of those regions, that however precipitous or rocky an ascent may be, each usually terminates in a *fertile* plateau, even at a height of between four and five thousand feet above the level of the sea. A people accustomed to such mountains can never be expelled from them. Driven from the coast, they fly to their valleys; let the enemy occupy every valley, they climb the eminence above him; march upon them there, they climb still higher and higher, finding, wherever they go, abundance of provisions; and, when they are refreshed, and the enemy fatigued with a warfare to which he is not habituated, and half starved in a country which he has desolated, they pounce upon him like eagles from their eyries, and cut him down like corn ripe for the sickle.

It is the policy, therefore, of Russia, to select certain points, which, if she can possess and maintain them, will enable her, not so much to keep Circassia in subjection, as to prevent the principal tribes from confederating against her upon any important crisis. To reduce all the tribes to her allegiance is a chimera which never enters her most sanguine councils. The next best effort of her power is to divide those tribes, by strong positions, and by incessant intrigues, from each other; and so, if she cannot take their arms from them, at least to render them pointless. Thus, last year the Cossacks captured a strong position on the Aboun, a tributary of the Kuban, which is so situated with reference to Soudjuk-Kalé and Ghelendjik to the south-east of that port, that if they had succeeded in establishing themselves there, they would ultimately have separated the north-western angle of Circassia from the remaining portions of that territory. It was in order to defeat this object that the Circassian princes had formed the confederation, in the promotion of which they were engaged when Mr. Spencer visited their country.

Proceeding to their camp (a chivalrous scene) he found them actively engaged in the prosecution of their purpose:

"As we descended from the mountain, the bright rays of the evening sun were shedding their rich effulgence over the beautiful valley,

watered by the Ubin and the Aphibs, tributaries of the Kuban; bosomy hills, covered with the richest verdure, gradually rose from their banks, crowned, at the extreme horizon, by the snowy pinnacles of the Caucassian alps. But it was not altogether the natural charms of the landscape that arrested my attention, so much as its animated features, for on that spot the confederated princes of Circassia, with their brave followers, were encamped, preparing to arrest the progress of the invader; and a more interesting, novel, or imposing spectacle, than they presented to the eye of a European, can hardly be conceived.

"The tents of the different chiefs were separately grouped (several of the true Hamaxobi form), surrounded by their clansmen, engaged in every description of warlike exercise; some hurling the javelin or hatchet at a mark, others practising with every species of weapon, from a poniard to a bow and arrow; here performing equestrian feats, there wrestling or running. Smiths, in one place, were to be seen, repairing fire-arms; in another, horses were being taught swimming, and mere infants riding; in short, it appeared as if fighting were the sole business of existence in this country.

"Still the pastoral habits of the people were not altogether lost sight of, as, in the far distance, the eye wandered over agricultural fields, filled with men, women, and children; their verdant pastures dotted with numerous flocks and herds.

"On discharging our fire-arms, which always announces the arrival of a chief, numbers of gallant warriors galloped forth from the tents and thickets, and, in a few seconds, we found ourselves surrounded by hundreds of the noblest patriots in Circassia; some dressed in the simple costume of the country, and others in glittering chain armour. It was then that the valiant chief, Hirsis, Sultoune Oglou, unfurled the splendid national banner he had just received from Stamboul, wrought by the beautiful hands of a Circassian princess, occupying a high station in the Turkish empire.

"At the sight of the long-expected national flag, thousands of swords flew in the air, and one universal long-continued shout of joy burst from the immense multitude. Never was there a greater display of enthusiasm, nor a fiercer determination exhibited by a people to defend their fatherland. Their common danger having awakened in their breasts, for the first time, a sense of the necessity of union, as the first and most necessary element to ensure success, every male throughout the whole country has sworn never to submit to the Russians, nor to enter into any commercial relation, nor hold any communication with them, under any pretence. The eternal feuds which had heretofore subsisted between chief and chief, tribe and tribe, have ceased; and those Circassians who had hitherto ravaged each other's territories, are now to be seen hand in hand, united by the closest bonds of fellowship."—vol. ii. p. 269-271.

A council of war was immediately afterwards held in a "sacred grove" contiguous to their camp; the trees were hung with

votive offerings—one of the beautiful expressions of the piety of the heart in all religions; and on a small hillock stood the remains of an ancient wooden-cross—the memorial doubtless of some pilgrims or missionaries who had visited those mountains. In front of that emblem, which, without knowing its true title to veneration, these chieftains looked upon with respect, they took their seats upon the green turf, the multitude standing around beneath the sylvan shade. The debate all tended in one direction—fierce hatred against the Russians; resolutions of permanent union and resistance against the invader. The sentiments expressed by the different orators are alike to those which we find also, according to M. de Marigny's information, entertained by the various separate tribes he had visited years ago. The result of the deliberations of the council Mr. Spencer did not remain to witness; but it has since proved that their plans of warfare were judicious. The garrison at Aboun, reduced by starvation, have been compelled to abandon their position. Soudjuk-Kalé—where the *Vixen* only made her appearance *too soon*—has been also deserted by the Russians. And we have little doubt that in due time the Circassians will be able to prove to Europe that they can not only proclaim, but maintain, their independence. Nor can it be questioned that the policy of England recommends their cause to our approbation. The barrier which their territory, their national prejudices, and their gallantry, can oppose to the further progress in that quarter of an empire already sufficiently powerful, is important, and as such it must be considered by our statesmen.

In a commercial point of view—a view of which it is our duty as a trading people never to lose sight—the establishment of Circassian independence could not be otherwise than advantageous. Mr. Spencer and M. de Marigny agree in reporting that the mountains contain lead and silver ore; and as particles of gold have been found in some rivulets, it is not improbable that gold mines may also be discovered in that country. With their admirable qualifications for mountain warfare, the Circassians combine also the habits of rural industry and virtue. Strange to say, they retain amongst them the notion, legalized amongst the Lacedemonians, that to steal, provided the act be performed with dexterity and success, is eminently laudable. A maiden looks upon her swain as entitled to no notice until he has made himself master of a neighbour's cow or steed, not however by any mean process of nocturnal depredation, but in the open day and with that sort of adroitness which also evinces courage. It is, therefore, the display of personal resolution, circumspection, and good-fortune, which is really admired—not

the appropriation of another man's goods. This, and other habits, however, of evil tendency, are only to be eradicated by throwing round that interesting people the toils of civilization. They only want, as a friend of ours remarked, "a little of our Newcastle smoke."

They possess a territory abounding in the charms of nature—their mountains, as well as their vallies, teem with fertility—immense herds of goats, sheep, horses, and oxen, may be seen browsing in all directions among herbage of incomparable luxuriance. The climate favours the cultivation of tobacco, cotton, rice, indigo, and saffron. The plants of our green houses grow in the open air. The oak, valonia, beech, ash, and elm, all the European fruit-trees, are found there in great abundance and perfection. The foliage of the linden extends far and wide over their hamlets, its aromatic flowers yield the elements of honey to their bees, and a tisane to themselves, and its bark may be made into sandals, baskets, mats, and substitutes for slates for their habitations. The Circassian yew, cherry, chesnut, box, and plane, are unequalled for the magnitude which they attain; and the *outchelia*, the wood of which is of a deep rose colour, possesses a close and variegated grain, susceptible of a high polish, which would seem to render it available for many ornamental purposes. The vine flourishes in great luxuriance in the forests. Cotton also, hemp and flax, may be grown on the flats with scarcely any trouble.

The custom, though a very ancient one, which sanctions the sale of their females, is one of the lamentable habits that would speedily be abolished among the Circassians, if they could be Europeanized. A father deems it no degradation to take a price for his daughter—a brother in the same way will, without a blush, set up his sister to auction, and dispose of her to the highest bidder. However, it is to be recollected, that in most parts of the East, the husband, instead of receiving a dower with his wife, pays one for her; and it is the notion of providing a handsome establishment for a female, rather than that of trafficking for the gain of the vendor, which usually presides in these transactions. The system of making predatory incursions, with a view to carry off supplies for the slave market, has been nearly put an end to, in consequence of the recent confederation of the principal tribes.

The whole Circassian coast offers excellent anchorage for navigators. The most northern port, Anapa, has been for some years, as we have already seen, in the possession of the Russians. But they are confined to the fortress, which bristles with cannon, while the heights around it are covered with armed men, at all

times prepared to resist any attempt on the part of the Russians to extend themselves beyond the walls. Mr. Spencer, before he commenced his excursions in the interior of Circassia, had the good fortune to be one of a party who accompanied Count Woronzow, the Governor-General of New Russia, on a steam-voyage round the coasts of the Black Sea. On their arrival, however, at Anapa, the Count landed, attended only by his Russian guests. The garrison happened at the time to be very unhealthy; and they had shortly before experienced more than one disaster in their conflicts with the natives, whose hostility, it seems, becomes every day not only more determined, but more skilfully directed, under the guidance, it is said, of an English officer who has served in India. Perhaps the Count did not choose to afford Mr. Spencer an opportunity of witnessing the slightness of the tenure by which his Imperial master held the entrance into Circassia. As a port for commerce Anapa can never be of much importance. It is shallow; and, in consequence of the violence of the winds which descend in hurricanes from the mountains, vessels at anchor there are frequently driven out to sea. The town chiefly consists of mud or wood cabins, thatched with reeds, or the leaves of Indian corn. It can only be supplied with good water from a mountain rivulet not far distant from the walls; but short as that distance is, the men who go out for the water are obliged to be escorted by a park of artillery with lighted matches!—so vigilant, so implacable is the hostility of the natives.

Soudjuk-Kalé is a much more important position. Its bay is a splendid one, affording safe anchorage, and opening into a fertile valley of great length, which communicates with several others, reaching to the very base of the Caucassian Alps. Ghelendjik, the next military station of the Russians on the coast, is about sixteen miles distant from Soudjuk-Kalé. The panorama unfolded to the steam-voyager along that shore is magical. Mountains, verdant from the water's edge to the highest peak, dotted by numberless flocks of snow-white sheep intermingled with buffaloes, oxen, jet-black goats, and beautiful half wild horses tossing their curved necks and flowing manes while bounding along the declivities; hamlets perched amidst embowering shades, above which may be seen curling, through the pure air, the smoke from chimney tops; shepherds in picturesque costumes leaning on their long spears; fields yellow with the exuberant harvest; camels laden with the precious sheaves, winding homeward over the hills and through the vallies, the bells suspended from their necks tinckling in the distance, combine altogether to constitute a picture of peace, plenty, and

happiness, the possession of which no man ought to forfeit while he can raise an arm to defend it.

The bay of Ghelendjik is one of the safest and most commodious harbours in the Black Sea. The entrance is between two capes, distant from each other little more than half a mile; its greatest breadth is about a mile and a quarter, and in length it runs somewhat more than two miles. The anchorage within the bay is good every where, varying in depth from fourteen fathoms to four. It is protected by the surrounding highlands from every wind that blows. The valley into which the bay opens is beautiful; it is irrigated by a transparent brook which would afford water in abundance for a large fleet. Here also the Russians have a *garrison*, but nothing more. In 1832, the Czar issued an ukase permitting Russian subjects to settle at Ghelendjik, and moreover granting them exemption from taxes, imposts, and military duties for twenty years, provided only that they would defend themselves from the natives. But the unfortunate adventurers who made the experiment soon found the woeful difficulties they had to contend against in executing the condition of their tenure. The mountaineers, who kept possession of the heights above the fortress, rendered every attempt to form a settlement hopeless; and the fortress alone, mounted with heavy guns, is still retained by the Russians, with the assistance of not less than two thousand men, a corvette, a brig of war, and three cutters.

About fourteen or fifteen miles further down the coast is the small bay of Pchad, still in the possession of the Circassians; so also is Kodos, another bay, twenty miles from the latter; these are succeeded by several creeks and miniature estuaries, as far as Vadran, where the celebrated defile of Jagra commences. Eighty miles below Vadran is the vast bay of Pitzounda, famed for its excellent anchorage, its great depth of water, and protected situation, being sheltered against the land winds by a chain of mountains, and from those of the sea by a lofty promontory. The only point at which it is exposed is the south-east, not considered to be dangerous in that part of the Euxine. This fine harbour is in possession of the Russians. Pitzounda is supposed to have been the site of the ancient Pythus, and to have formed, in that direction, the frontier of the Byzantine empire. The remains of a monastery and of a church, built in the form of a Greek cross, still exist there in excellent preservation. The church appears to have been erected by Justinian.

From Pitzounda to Souchum-Kalé, the last of the Circassian ports, the distance is computed to be thirty miles. When possessed by the Turks it was a considerable town, containing at least three thousand inhabitants. Since it has become Russian

it has dwindled down to a dozen wretched huts. It is garrisoned by Russian troops, not one of whom dare venture beyond the walls without an escort of cannon. At night they are obliged even to surround the walls with watch-dogs, so unrelenting is the animosity of the natives, who, from the adjacent eminences, shoot the Russians even in their barrack-yard.

Redout-Kalé, in Mingrelia, is boasted of by the Russians as an emporium of no small importance. The town is situated at a distance of several miles from the coast, on the river Kopi, the ancient Cyanes, in the midst of a marsh covered with reeds fourteen feet high, and of course, in such a climate, about the most insalubrious site that could possibly have been chosen for a great commercial port. Instead of a populous city, as it is usually represented to be, it is almost a desert; its spacious bazaars, which -adventurers had filled some years ago with European goods, under the idea of opening a trade by caravans to Persia, Georgia, and the eastern provinces of Russia, are shut up, and the merchants have betaken themselves to the Turkish port of Trebizond, now the most prosperous town on the Euxine.

The improvement of Trebizond has lately attracted the serious attention of the Sultan. It may be said to have three bays, none of which afford, in their present state, secure anchorage. They are all, however, capable of being rendered perfectly safe, and plans have been proposed for the purpose, which are, we believe, still under discussion. In the mean time steam is working its usual wonders in that direction. Trebizond is already a grand depôt for British manufactures, which are conducted thence by caravans to Persia, and the interior of Asia Minor. Mr. Spencer suggests to our cloth manufacturers the fabrication of those red caps now usually worn by the Turks, which, he thinks, would be certain of finding immediate sale, as they are gradually becoming the head-dress of the whole eastern population. We repeat the hint, as we quite agree with him in thinking that the speculation could hardly fail to be successful. The country surrounding Trebizond is remarkably fertile of nuts, similar to those of Spain, chestnuts and walnuts, which are so good that they form considerable articles of export. The vine and olive might also be cultivated there to a great extent, as well as flax and hemp. But it is as a depôt for merchandise, to be distributed through a vast and daily improving series of markets, that Trebizond is to be contemplated by British enterprise. In that point of view its rising importance can hardly be exaggerated.

It cannot be doubted that so far as the influence of Russia extends, our commerce will have to meet with every possible

discouragement in all the ports which she can control. Mr. Spencer states, that in a coasting voyage which he made from Odessa round the Crimea, he did not see "a single British flag waving over the blue waters of the Euxine." "Indeed," he adds, "during the whole of my cruises on this sea, I felt as if transported to some unknown hemisphere: for to whatever part of the globe my stars had hitherto guided me, wherever there was a sea, there I found our beloved banner—there I was greeted with the rough but cordial welcome of our gallant tars." At Trebizond, he found the bazaars filled with merchandise, the creation of British industry, and the British flag unfurled over nearly every ship in the harbour; and he very properly recommends that a country of so much importance to our interests as Turkey, ought to be conciliated by all the means which we can bring into action for that purpose.

The works in progress at Sevastopol, which the stipendiary writers of Russia, stationed throughout Europe, have been instructed, from time to time, to underrate, as if they were mere harbour repairs, appear to indicate a settled design upon the part of the Czar to assume the complete dominion of the Euxine. No expense has been spared upon the fortifications, which Mr. Spencer, who went over them, states to be of the most formidable description. They are to be mounted by eight hundred guns. The admiralty, arsenal, and dock-yards, now constructing under the direction of Mr. Upton, an English engineer, are upon a gigantic scale.

"As a sufficient supply of water for the reservoirs could not be procured nearer than at a distance of ten or twelve wersts, yet this obstacle has been surmounted by means of an aqueduct—a most colossal enterprise, and worthy of the best days of Roman grandeur: for we find it at one place tunnelled through a mountain of rock, then thrown across a valley, and, being at the same time tastefully designed, it forms a very pretty feature in the landscape. Indeed, we are every where reminded, at Sevastopol, of the active energy of the Russian government. The ship-builder's axe is constantly heard mingling its sounds with the stone-cutter's chisel. Besides thousands of masons and carpenters, there are thousands of soldiers employed as hodmen: nor are these the only striking evidences of Russian spirit and enterprise; for contiguous to the harbour we find an immense mountain of rock in the act of being removed, in order to afford space for the erection of the admiralty, arsenal, and other public buildings; an undertaking which could only be accomplished in such an empire as this, with its population of serfs and labouring soldiers."—vol. ii. pp. 52-3.

When to the construction of such a maritime station as Sevastopol, in the principal harbour of which the fleets of nations might

ride secure from any storm, we add the fact, as stated by Mr. Spencer, upon official authority, that Russia has in the Euxine a squadron consisting of fourteen line-of-battle ships, eight frigates of sixty guns, five corvettes, ten brigs, four schooners, nine cutters, and seven steamers, besides several transports (under the command of Admiral Lazareff), we must conclude that such preparations as these have some object in view beyond the mere police of that sea. Preponderance over Turkey is thus at once achieved. The power of the Sultan has been forced gradually to recede from the Crimea, to one port after another, along the coasts of Circassia, Mingrelia, and Gouriel, on one side, and from Odessa to Varna on the other. It is true that the efforts of the Czar to control the navigation of the Danube, to which all nations have an undoubted right under the treaty of Vienna, have failed. It is also to be taken into account that the Circassian ports, of which he has no more than military possession, are so many burthens, exhausting his resources—so precarious in possession that he cannot count upon them as Russian even for a week; that all his plans for investing Odessa and Redout-Kalé with commercial importance have been baffled by his own narrow-minded legislation; that Trebizond promises to be the great mart of the Euxine for Asiatic produce and importation, and that his seamen, whom his ice-bound dominions prevent from serving usually more than six months in the year, are infinitely inferior to those of almost any other country. These are all decisive indications of inherent impotency which it will require ulterior measures to overcome. But those measures are obvious—indeed they are proclaimed. The sovereignty of the whole coast of the Euxine, and of the European provinces of Turkey, are essential to his supremacy—and to that great object all his councils tend with an instinctive energy, which would seem to be irresistible.

It is, however, but an apparent exhibition of strength, which, resolved into its elements, ceases to be formidable, at least to England. We can, in the present position of our naval power, imagine no circumstances which could prevent our Mediterranean fleet from penetrating to the Black Sea, and compelling, if we could not “sink, burn, or destroy” them, every Russian boat in those waters to take refuge within the harbour of Sevastopol. It would be an affair of no difficulty to expel the Russians from every nook they possess in Gouriel, Mingrelia and Circassia, and to erect the latter into a barrier, beyond which the Moscovite never again could hope to plant his standard. We have the *power* to do all this—and more—and Russia feels it.

Our Cabinet is perfectly conversant with the details of this question, and prepared to act whenever the fit moment for action shall arrive. It becomes, therefore, unnecessary to assume that Quixotic air of defiance which certain enthusiasts are perpetually forcing upon the public mind of this country, with reference to Eastern affairs. The motives of those gentlemen, no doubt, are highly patriotic; but it would be as well that they should attend to the duties belonging to their own sphere, and leave matters of state policy to the care of those to whom the nation has entrusted them.*

* In the meantime it should be borne in mind that there are no two nations in Europe whose best interests more depend upon the cultivation of mutual amity, than Russia and Great Britain. The pamphlet, whose title stands the last upon our list, furnishes, in a single paragraph, the best "security" into which either could enter for the preservation of "the peace." The whole document is well worthy of consideration.

"A late number of the *Journal of St. Petersburg* contains a continuation of the series of articles, drawn from official sources on the European Trade of the Empire in the year 1835. Under the head of 'European Commerce,' the following information is communicated:—

"The first place in the list is clearly due to Great Britain, whence goods were imported by Russia to the amount of 71,360,613 rubles; and to which country Russian goods were exported to the amount of 90,293,377 R. The chief articles of importation were spun cotton, indigo, dye-wood, salt, coffee, cotton and cotton goods. The exports consisted of tallow, linseed, hemp, wool, bristles, timber, raw hides, and iron. The value of the exports was greater than that of the imports by 13,475,319 R.

"To Turkey (including Greece) were chiefly exported, wheat, iron, tallow, wool; and imported, wine, fruit, olive-oil, cotton, and raw silk. The exports were to the amount of 22,907,195 R.; the imports, of 13,584,334 R. Balance in favour of Russia, 9,322,861 R.

"From the Hans Towns (Hamburg, Lubeck, and Bremen), the chief imports were silk goods, silk, tobacco, coloured paper, and raw sugar, to the amount of 26,414,483 R. The exports (potash, copper, linseed, furs, lamp-oil, linen, &c.) were to the amount of 6,137,587 R. Balance in favour of the Hans Towns, 20,276,896 R.

"France.—The chief imports from this country were wines; the chief exports to it, copper, hemp, linseed, wool, and bristles. The former were to the amount of 14,437,944 R. (wine forming half the value); the latter, of 8,820,921 R. (including copper, of the value of 3,600,000 R.) Balance in favour of France, 6,157,023 R.

"Austria.—The exports consisted of cattle, wheat, wool, furs, wax, Russian leather, raw hides, &c.; the imports, of scythes and sickles; silk; woollen, silk, and cotton goods. The former were to the value of 10,952,587 R.; the latter of 11,580,997 R. Balance in favour of Austria, 637,410 R.

"Prussia.—The exports were timber, tallow, linseed, hemp, potash, &c.; the imports were silk, silk goods, fish and salt. The former were to the amount of 11,253,223 R.; the latter of 9,416,080 R. Balance in favour of Russia, 1,837,139 R.

"Italy.—The chief imports consisted of fruit, olive oil, &c., to the amount of 4,689,552 R. Wheat, Russian leather, &c., to the amount of 3,438,647 R., were the principal exports. Balance in favour of Italy, 1,250,905 R.

"Holland.—The principal exports were linseed, hemp, timber, potash, copper, &c. to the amount of 10,267,502 R.; the chief imports were madder, tobacco, wine, raw sugar, woollen goods, jewels, &c., to the amount, altogether, of 7,150,312 R. Balance in favour of Russia, 3,111,190 R.

"Spain and Portugal.—The chief exports were flax and hemp; the chief imports

Mr. Spencer's work affords much valuable information upon the actual condition and resources of Circassia. We have been delighted with his descriptions of that beautiful country, and of the customs and manners of the interesting tribes by whom it is chiefly occupied. A considerable portion of both his volumes is dedicated to the purpose of rendering the Circassians more known to Europe, and of obtaining for them, particularly, the sympathies of England, in the struggle upon which they have embarked for the final establishment of their national independence. His efforts promise to be successful. There is a cordiality in his style, superior to all affectation, and a sincerity in his zeal, free from all taint of personal views, which will go far towards recommending his production and his purpose to every class of readers. His flight—for such it was—along the Danube necessarily prevented him from adding any thing of importance to the information previously supplied upon that subject.—Mr. M'Gregor's work on *Austria and the Austrians* is still more deficient upon the latter point, and this is the more to be regretted, as the author does not appear to have been so hurried in his voyage as either of his two predecessors. It must also be remarked, that from negligence, or from some other cause, perhaps indisposition, or absence from London during the printing of his volumes, they abound in faults of style, and even grammatical errors for which a school boy would be punished. But, on the other hand, we cannot too much applaud the spirit of truth, the total freedom from religious and political prejudices, in which the whole of his work is penned. It contains much valuable statistical information relative, particularly, to the Archduchy of Austria, and it gives a juster picture of the real happiness enjoyed by the inhabitants of that favoured district than any other book with which we are acquainted. Commercial men will find much useful matter in Mr. Triebner's report, and the "statistical account" mentioned at the head of this article.

wine and salt. The former were, altogether, to the amount of 3,248,626 R.; the latter of 4,612,626 R. Balance in favour of Spain and Portugal, 1,363,881 R.

"Sweden and Norway.—The chief exports were hemp, tallow, linseed, and linen; the chief article of importation was fish. The former were to the value of 3,534,419 R.; the latter of 4,196,622 R. Balance in favour of Sweden and Norway, 662,203 R.

"Denmark.—The exports were linseed, flax, hemp, timber, &c. to the amount, altogether, of 5,454,886 R. The imports were of different foreign goods, to the value of 1,514,583 R. Balance in favour of Russia, 3,940,353 R.

ART. X.—*Théorie Analytique des Probabilités*. Par M. le Marquis de Laplace, &c. &c. 3ième édition. Paris. 1820.

IN continuing our remarks upon the work of which the title is now before the reader's eye, we must remind him that we have not room to enter at length upon the subject. We have already discussed considerations of a practical character, tending to shew that upon several questions, in which recourse is actually had to the theory of probabilities, insufficiency of information produces effects prejudicial to the pecuniary interests of those concerned. This is indeed a strong point: we might urge any plan of prospective utility upon the English public, till we were tired, and without awakening the least attention. Nor would there be any reason to complain of such a result; for the present is an age of suggestions, and every person who can read and write has some scheme in hand, by which the community is to be advantaged: no wonder, then, that so few of the speculations in question have more than one investigator. But when we speak of the theory of probabilities, we bring forward a something upon which, right or wrong, many tens of millions of pounds sterling depend. The insurance offices, the friendly societies, all annuitants and all who hold life interests of any species—again, all who insure their goods from fire, or their ships from wreck—are visibly and immediately interested in the dissemination of correct principles upon probability in general. So much for that which actually is invested: now with regard to that which might be, let it be remembered, that whenever money is hazarded in commerce or manufactures, by those who would resign the possibility of more than average profit, if they might thereby be secured from the risk of disastrous loss, the desired arrangement is rendered impossible, by the want of knowledge how to apply the theory of probabilities, combined with the defect of methodized information upon the contingencies in question.

The name of the *theory of probabilities* is odious in the eyes of many, for, as all the world knows, it is the new phrase for the computation of chances, the instrument of gamblers, and, for a long time, of gamblers only; meaning, by that word, not the people who play with stocks and markets, but with cards, dice, and horses. Such an impression was the inevitable consequence of the course pursued by the earlier writers on the subject, who filled their books entirely with problems relative to games of chance. This was not so much a consequence of the nature of the subject, as of the state of mathematical knowledge at the

time: games of chance, involving a given and comparatively small number of cases, are of easy calculation, and require only the application of simple methods; while questions of natural philosophy, or concerning the common affairs of life, involve very large numbers of cases, and require a more powerful analysis. Consequently, the older works abound with questions upon games of chance, while later writings begin to display the power of applying the very same principles to wider as well as more useful inquiries.

This objection to the tendency of the theory of probability, or the doctrine of chances, is as old as the time of De Moivre; who was not, however, able to meet it, by extending the subject matter of his celebrated treatise. In the second edition, published in 1738, he writes thus, in his dedication to a Lord Carpenter: "There are many people in the world who are prepossessed with an opinion, that the doctrine of chances has a tendency to promote play; but they soon will be undeceived, if they think fit to look into the general design of this book. In the mean while, it will not be improper to inform them, that your lordship is pleased to espouse the patronage of this second edition," &c. &c. The general design of De Moivre's work appears to be, the analysis of every game of chance which prevailed in his time; and the author seems to have imagined that he could not attract attention to any other species of problems.

In reviewing the *general design* of the work of Laplace, we desire to make the description of a book mark the present state of a science. In any other point of view, it would be superfluous to give an account of a standard treatise, which is actually in the hands of a larger number of persons than are able to read it.

In considering simple questions of chances, we place ourselves, at the outset, in hypothetical possession of a set of circumstances, and attribute to ourselves exact and rigorous knowledge. We assume that we positively know every case that can arrive, and also that we can estimate the relative probabilities of the several cases. This of itself has a tendency to mislead the beginner, because these known circumstances are generally expressed by means of some simple gambling hypothesis. A set of balls which have been drawn, 83 white and 4 black, places us in the same position with regard to our disposition to expect white or black for the future, as that in which we should stand if we had observed 83 successful and 4 unsuccessful speculations in a matter of business: it matters nothing as to the amount of the chances for the future, whether the observed event be called the drawing of a white ball, or the acquirement of a profit. Never-

theless, the abstraction of the idea of probability from the circumstances under which it is presented, sometimes throws a difficulty in the way.

The science of probability has also this in common with others, that the problems which most naturally present themselves in practice are of an inverse character, as compared with those which an elementary and deductive course first enables the student to solve. If we know that out of 1000 infants born, 900 live a year, it is sufficiently easy to understand why we say that it is nine to one any specified individual of them will live a year. But seeing that we can only arrive at such knowledge by observation, and also that such observation must be limited, there arises this very obvious preliminary question—Having registered a certain thousand infants, and found that, *of that thousand*, nine hundred were alive at the end of a year, what presumption arises from thence that something like the same proportion would obtain if a second thousand were registered? For instance, would it be wise to lay an even bet that the results of the second trial would exhibit something between 850 and 950, in place of 900? Or, to generalize the form of the question, let us imagine a thousand balls to have been drawn from a lottery containing an infinite number; of which it is found that there are 721 white, 116 red, and 163 black. We may then ask, what degree of presumption ought to be considered as established—1. That the contents of the lottery are all white, red, and black, and of no other colour? 2. That the white and red balls are distributed throughout the whole mass, nearly in the proportion of 721 white to 116 red? This is a question which must present itself previously to the deduction of any inference upon the probable results of future drawings: but at the same time, it is not of the most direct and easy class, requiring, in fact, the previous discussion of many methods which are subsequent in the order of application.

It is common to assume that any considerable number of observations will give a result nearly coinciding with the average of the whole. The constructors of the Northampton and Carlisle tables (see the last Number, p. 344) did not think it necessary to ask whether 2,400 and 861 cases of mortality would of themselves furnish a near approximation to the law which actually prevails in England. It had been long admitted, or supposed, that a considerable number of deaths (no definite number being specified) would present a table of mortality, such as might be depended upon for pecuniary transactions. It is true that such is the case; but the proposition is one requiring that sort of examination and demonstration which Laplace has

given. We shall *not* stop to rebut any conclusion which might be drawn against the utility of the theory, from the circumstance of common sense having felt for and attained some of its most elaborate results: but we *shall* stop to remark, that in the case of a speculation, so very delicate, so very liable to be misunderstood, and, above all, accessible to so small a part of the educated world, it is a great advantage that there exist such landmarks, as propositions which, though distant results of theory, yet coincide with the notions of the world at large, and are supposed to have evidence of their own.

When we have learnt that the result of analysis agrees with general opinion, in admitting the safety of relying upon a comparatively small number of cases to determine a general average, we then become disposed to rely on the same analysis for correctly determining the probable limits of accidental fluctuation.

The two-fold object of the theory is, then, firstly, to determine the mean, or average state of things; secondly, to ascertain what degree of fluctuation may be reasonably expected. Let it be remarked, that the common theory of chances applies itself almost entirely to the first-mentioned problem: when we say that we determine the probability of an event to be two-sevenths, we mean, that, taking every possible case in which the said event can happen, we shall find that it will happen twice out of seven times. Such is then the general average: but, supposing that we select 700 possible cases out of the whole, it does not therefore become probable, or more likely than not, that the event shall happen precisely 200 times, and fail precisely 500 times. All that becomes very likely is, that the number of arrivals shall be nearly 200, and of non-arrivals nearly 500; and it is one of the most important objects of the theory, to ascertain within what limits there is a given amount of probability that the departure from the general average shall be contained.

The question thus enunciated is of no small practical importance, and to the neglect of it we must attribute the supposed necessity for the large capitals with which many undertakings are commenced. (See last Number, p. 342.) Let us imagine an insurance office to be founded, and, for the sake of simplicity, let it take no life except at the age of 30. Let the materials for its management consist in the examination of a register of 1,000 lives, which have been found to drop in the manner pointed out, say by the Carlisle table. The premium which should be demanded is then easily ascertained; but its security depends upon two circumstances—1. That the 1,000 lives so recorded, shall represent the general mortality. 2. That the

amount of business obtained by the office, shall be so large as to render their actual experience another representation of the same general average. Neither of these conditions can be precisely attained; some small allowance must be made for both; and the question is, what amount of additional premium is necessary to cover the risk of fluctuation?—what number of insured lives will be sufficient to begin with?—or, supposing that all risks are to be taken, what is the smallest capital upon which a commencement can prudently be made, without any security for a large amount of business?

Perhaps we could not in fewer words convey an idea of the different states of the science in the times of De Moivre and Laplace, than by stating, that the former could have ascertained the requisite premium, and that the latter could have made the necessary additions for fluctuation, &c.

We now pass from matters of business,—as to which we can only say what might be done,—to questions connected with the sciences of observation and experiment, in which we can appeal to what has been done. In every branch of inquiry which involves the actual use of our physical senses, the repetition of a process will always afford a series of discordances, varying in amount with the method used, the skill of the observer, and the nature of the observation. If the observed discordances present anything like uniformity of character, we are naturally led to conclude, that they are not, properly speaking, the results of errors of observation, but of some unknown law, by which the predicted or expected result is modified. If the discrepancy merely arise from error of observation, we must suppose that it will be sometimes of one kind and sometimes of another; sometimes producing a result larger than might have been expected, and sometimes smaller. Now, having noticed a set of observations which do not agree, it is one of the first objects of the theory to settle what presumption should exist that the variations are accidental (that is, totally unregulated by apparent or discoverable law), or that they follow a law which then becomes the object of investigation. The case taken by Laplace, as an illustration, will do for the same purpose here. It was suspected that, independently of local fluctuations, the barometer was always a little higher in the morning than in the afternoon. To settle this point, four hundred days were chosen, in which the barometer was remarkably steady, not varying four millimetres in any one day. This was done to avoid the large fluctuations, which would have rendered the changes in question, if such there were, imperceptible. It was found that the sum of the heights of the barometer at nine in the morning, exceeded the sum

of the heights at four in the afternoon, by four hundred millimetres,—or, one day with another, by a millimetre a day. But what can we infer from such a circumstance, is the first suggestion? A millimetre, or about the twenty-fifth part of an inch, is so very small a variation, that considering the nature of the observation, and the imperfections of the instrument, it seems, at first, perfectly admissible, that mere instrumental error might have occasioned such a discrepancy. The theory of probabilities gives an entirely different notion: it appears that it is many millions to one against such a phenomenon presenting itself, upon the supposition that it was produced by nothing but the casual imperfections of the instrument. A very great probability was therefore given to the supposition, that there really exists a diurnal variation of the barometer, in virtue of which, *ceteris paribus*, it is a little higher at one particular part of the day than at another.

In this way, Laplace actually used the theory of probabilities as a method of discovery. He expressly affirms (p. 355), that the irregularity in the lunar motions, which he afterwards showed to depend on the figure of the earth, was pointed out to him as not being of a merely casual character, by his having “*soumis son existence au calcul des probabilités.*” Of another of his most brilliant results, he says as distinctly (p. 356), “*L’Analyse des probabilités m’a conduit pareillement à la cause des grandes irrégularités de Jupiter et de Saturne.*” There is much in these assertions which will appear not a little singular, even to those versed in the subject. But, there are two circumstances which afford presumption, not only of the good faith of Laplace, but of his freedom from a mistaken bias for a favourite subject. In the first place, it somewhat lowers the opinion which the world at large entertains of a philosopher, when he is found using means, instead of penetrating mysteries by pure thought. The Newton of the world at large sat down under a tree, saw an apple fall, and after an intense reverie, the length of which is not stated, got up, with the theory of gravitation well planned, if not fit to print. It is painful to be obliged to add, that the Newton of Trinity College Cambridge, of whom there is no manner of doubt that he was the hero of the preceding myth, not only was to a large extent indebted to the perusal of what his predecessors had written, but went through years of deduction and comparison,—abandoned his theory, on account of its non-agreement with some existing observations,—took it up again upon trial when new sets of observations had been made,—and, in point of fact, went through a detail which was a great deal more like a book-keeping operation, than the poetical process of

the fable. Partial as Laplace might be to the theory of probabilities, we question the likelihood of his being so far wedded to it, as to wish it should appear that he had used a method, instead of unassisted sagacity. The fault of discoverers generally lies in an opposite extreme: they conceal the simple suggestions which led them on the road, and by presenting a finished and elaborate train of deduction, rather strive to provoke applause, than to facilitate imitation. In the second place, Laplace made the theory of probabilities overturn results, as well as establish them. One of the most difficult and original inquiries in which he engaged, was the question of the *tides in the atmosphere*, answering to those in the ocean, and produced by the same causes. That such tides must exist, to some degree or other, cannot be questioned by any one who admits the theory of gravitation: the point was to ascertain what the laws of the phenomenon ought to be, and whether corresponding appearances could be detected to any *sensible* extent. Laplace investigated the deduction of the law in a brilliant manner,—and carefully examined barometrical observations, which of course exhibited a mixed amount of error and actually prevailing law. But upon submitting the result to the test of the theory of probabilities, there was not found to be strong presumption that any part of the diurnal variation arose from such a law as was shewn by theory to be a consequence of the luni-solar action: and the theory, beautiful as it is, was honestly abandoned. We assume then, that Laplace did not deceive himself, when he attributed a part of his success in the explanation of the phenomena, to his use of the theory of probabilities; and we pass on to another division of the subject.

All observations are liable to error: if we were to take, for instance, all the altitudes which had ever been measured by a given theodolite and a given observer,—and if we could ascertain what the correct truth was in each instance, we should find many observations wrong by half-a-minute or less; but much fewer in number wrong by something more than half a minute. The *law of facility* of error, is a term we use to express the chance of an error being under a given amount: to speak mathematically, let ϕx express the chance; that the error of a single observation is not so great as x , then the function ϕx is called the law of facility. Nothing can be more obvious than that the law of facility may vary with the phenomenon to be observed, the general character of the observer, his state of body or mind for the time, &c. &c.

At the same time, there is one conclusion in which all the scientific world was agreed, on every subject, for every instru-

ment, &c.; namely, that when a number of observations disagreed with each other, the way of determining their most probable result, was to take the *average* of all the observations. But it must be obviously proper to ask, can this method be true, whatever might have been the qualities of the observer, the instrument, &c.? Is it likely that the same rule for deducing the probable truth would apply to the bungler and the practised observer, the near and the far-sighted,—to Hipparchus without a telescope, missing whole degrees, and Bradley, with his zenith sector, measuring seconds? There never was perhaps a case, in which the application of strict investigation was more likely to play havoc with the prevailing opinion of preceding ages. Such was not, however, the case; and we have here a striking instance of the manner in which existing notions have been confirmed by the march of science.

The theory of probabilities draws a remarkable distinction between observations which have been made, and those which are to be made. Suppose it required of an experimenter, that he should choose his method of treating his results previously to obtaining them, and then, whatever his tendency to err may be, provided only that he is not more likely to measure too much than too little,—or, in technical language, that positive and negative errors are equally likely,—the method of averaging is the best which he can take. But let him be allowed to defer his choice of a process until the observations are finished, and the process of averaging is not then the best which can be chosen, unless it can be shown that one particular law of facility, pointed out by the theory, is the one to which he is really subject. Some little account of the reason of this paradox may be easily given. The probability of any event is not a quality of the event itself, but an impression of the mind, depending upon our state of knowledge with regard to the causes of the event. If A feel certain that an urn contains nothing but white balls, and B that half of its contents are black, the two are really in different circumstances, and the probability of a drawing being white is not the same to both. Now *before* the observations are made, there is no presumption to guide the observer in suspecting any law of facility; but afterwards, the observations themselves furnish an imperfect knowledge of the nature of the law of facility. For instance, this much at least will be seen, that if the results of observation be near to each other, the tendency to error is small, and if they differ very much, the same tendency is considerable. Now, since it is always competent to the observer to choose his method of proceeding when he pleases; it follows, that the common notion cannot be strictly applicable to the results of any case.

But, at the same time it appeared, singularly enough, that whatever the law of facility may be, the more numerous the observations, the more nearly does their average present the most probable result. And more than this, the approximation implied in the preceding sentence takes place so rapidly, that a moderate number of observations is sufficient to allow of its application. There is another consideration, which cannot well be explained to any but the mathematician; namely, that the law of facility, under which the average is strictly the most probable result, contains an arbitrary constant, by means of which a particular case of it may be made a sufficient approximation to any law of facility which can be believed to exist. Practically then, the method of averaging, as universally used, has that tendency to promote correctness, as compared with other methods, which it has always been thought to have.

As it is rather our object to shew the bearings of the science on the notions of mankind, than to make a digest of results, we shall here take notice of another theorem, in which propositions, generally admitted, but apparently wholly unconnected, are shewn to be dependent, so that one of them cannot be true without the other. It has not been noticed by Laplace, but has been deduced by ourselves from the principles employed by him and all other writers.

Firstly,—the value of any sum of money is always considered as dependent upon the whole of which it forms a part. A guinea is *nothing* to a rich man, but a *great deal* to a poor man; and, on the same principle, no trader contemplates the gain or loss of a given sum, otherwise than with reference to the whole capital which is invested to produce it. Among the various ways in which a part may be compared with the whole, the simple proportion, per centage, or whatever it may be called, is that which is universally adopted; we shall say, then, that the value of any piece of money is to be measured by its proportion to the whole sum of which it is considered as a part.

Secondly,—the effect of life insurance is considered, in a point of view imported by its name: it is not called the insurance of a certain sum *at death*, but the insurance *of life*. It is then taken as placing every person who avails himself of it, in the position of being sure to live a certain time. But, if we consider that those who live long must pay more than they receive, in order that those who die before their time may receive more than they pay, it is clear, that life insurance amounts to an equalization of life, or the assigning to each person the average share of life. Thus the effect of guaranteeing sums of money

at death, for premiums properly calculated, is equivalent to insuring the average term of life.

These two propositions, both, to all appearance, highly reasonable in themselves, are not visibly connected with each other; either might be true, it should seem, without the other. But this is not the fact; for it can be shown, that if either of them be false, the other falls with it. If, for instance, a person should affirm, that a guinea, to a man who is insured for a hundred, is to be considered as precisely the same thing to him as the same sum is to another person insured for a thousand, then it can be proved that he contradicts himself, if he imagine that the effect of life insurance is equivalent to the equalization of life in all persons who begin at the same age. There is great analogy between the dependence just explained, and that which prevails between the method of averaging, and the existence of one particular law of facility; and many common notions, examined by the test of the theory of probability, will either confute or confirm each other.

The crowning proposition in the application of the theory to natural philosophy, is undoubtedly that known as the *method of least squares*, to which astronomy, in particular, lies under very great obligations. In fact, we may safely say, that the time must have arrived, when, but for this aid, additional observation would have ceased to carry additional accuracy into our knowledge of the celestial motions. It will somewhat diminish the effect of the technical term “method of least squares,” if we state, that the method of averaging is a particular case of it, so that a farmer, who calculates his probable crop by taking an average bushel from his several soils, proceeds by the method of least squares, as much as an astronomer, who uses it to determine the elements of a comet’s orbit. We remember having heard the following problem proposed, which is an ingenious illustration of the cases to which the method applies. A large target is erected, with a small chalk mark, (not necessarily in the middle) and a number of persons, all of whom are tolerably certain of hitting the target, and all of whom are equally likely to miss the chalk in any direction from it, fire in succession, say with sharp-pointed arrows. The chalk is then rubbed out, and the target, with all the arrows sticking in it, is presented to a mathematician, who is required to say what point, judging from the position of the arrows, is the one which was fired at. His investigation will lead him to the following result; he must ascertain that point in the target, from which, if lines were drawn to all the points of the arrows, the sum of the squares of those

lines would be the least possible. From the answer to such questions always requiring the sum of certain squares to be made the least possible, the method derives its name. It is not of course asserted, that the process described would infallibly discover the place where the chalk mark existed; but if the same person were to try the method upon a hundred such targets, losing at the rate of a given sum for every inch by which he was wrong, he would certainly lose less by acting in the manner described than by any other process.

Singularly enough, it was not as a result of the theory of probabilities, but as a convenient and easily practicable process, that the method of least squares first appeared. Legendre and Gauss, independently of each other (though the former first published it) saw the utility of such an addition to astronomical computation. It is to Laplace that we owe its introduction as the best theoretical mode of ascertaining the *most probable* result of discordant observations. His investigation wants clearness and elegance; but is in other respects one of his most brilliant labours. The beauty, generality, and simplicity of the result secured for it an immediate admission into every process, though the demonstration is of a kind which there are not many to understand: the process is one which has the air of being highly probable, and seems in itself to be free from objections which might be proposed against any other method. But at the same time it appears to us, that many have used it without a thorough comprehension of its meaning; and just as we now say that astronomy must have stopped its career of increasing accuracy, if the method of least squares had not been introduced, so we will venture to hope the time must come when the same remark shall be made upon an improved and extended way of using it.

The difficulty of admitting several points connected with the theory of probabilities, arises from the neglect to make an important distinction; namely, between the correctness or incorrectness of the hypothesis assumed, and that of the inferences which are drawn from it. Let it be proposed to apply mathematical reasoning to the valuation of the credibility of evidence, and the answer appears simple—namely, that such a proposition must be the result of an overheated imagination. This would be a fair answer if it were required to apply calculation to the character and actions of a given man, with a view of ascertaining whether he were likely or not to tell the truth in a particular case. Mathematics will not tell us whether A and B are credible witnesses, nor whether, supposing them credible, their evidence will be as much as should in prudence be considered sufficient for the establishment of any particular point. Nor will mathematics enable us to measure a length in feet, or to reason upon

it, unless we first know by other than mathematical means, what is that length which it is agreed to call a foot. But let a foot be known, and we can then assign lines, areas, and solids, by means of numbers; and, in like manner, let the credibility of one witness be given, and we can then determine that which results from the joint evidence of two or more, or from the evidence of any number, contradicted by any other number. By the credibility of a witness, we are supposed to mean the probability that an assertion advanced by him will be correct, the moment before the assertion is made.

For instance, suppose it admitted that a jury of twelve men, all equally likely to be correct in any particular verdict, decide wrongly once out of fifty times. It is matter of pure algebra to find out how often each of them, using his own unassisted judgment, would come to erroneous decisions. It is also the province of algebra to determine how often a jury would err, if, upon the preceding hypothesis as to the correctness of twelve men, the number were reduced or increased. Laplace, and others before him, have made extensive applications of analysis to such questions; but their labours in this respect have been misunderstood, and always must be, until the province of mathematical reasoning is better understood by the world at large.

We have now, we believe, briefly touched upon the principal subjects which are to be found in the *Théorie des Probabilités*. The subject is one which must make its way slowly, having to extricate itself from its old connexion with games of chance, before it can take its proper place as an agent in statistical and political enquiry. One of our principal objects in writing the present articles has been to show that the nature of probability may be treated, and its results applied, without the mention of dice or cards. Laplace himself has introduced a few problems connected with common gambling, in some instances on account of their historical notoriety, in others because they afforded easy and striking examples of the application of generating functions, the theory of which was introduced in his work. But the greater part of the treatise is full of such questions as those which have been alluded to in the preceding pages, bearing in the most direct manner on the way to draw correct inferences from physical and statistical facts.

If we can make a few reflecting individuals understand, that, be the theory of probabilities true or false, valuable or useless, its merits must be settled by a reference to something more than the consideration of a few games at cards, we shall have done all which we ventured to propose to ourselves.

ART. XI.—*Summary Review of Italian and German Catholic Literature, from January to June 1837.*

THE field of Italian Catholic Literature is neither as varied nor as extensive as that of France, Germany, and England. Italy has not, like France, suffered from the ravages of systematic infidelity, nor has the press teemed with two classes of works, entirely opposite in their nature, one of which is filled with attacks on every thing that is Catholic or that is Christian, while the other is employed in exposing the errors and confuting the attacks made in the former. This description of works has appeared chiefly in France, during the last and present century, and each day a new party of combatants has appeared on the lists: but, from these systematic attacks, Italy has been free, and consequently, in a notice of its literature at the present period, the reader is not wearied with a continual series of works, in the very titles of which, every Christian discerns a fresh insult on his religion. Italy has, moreover, maintained in a very large majority the religion of ancient times; nor are the different states divided into an endless variety of religious opinions. England and Germany hear of nothing, in religious literature, except the controversial publications of one or other of these parties; each sect in England or Germany has its apostles and its champions, whose works, applauded by their own party, and censured and condemned by the rest of the nation, agitate the minds of men, and too often, unfortunately, break the bonds of charity and peace. Italy, on the other hand, has felt the benefits and seen the advantages of uniformity in belief. From these two classes of combatants—those who attack religious opinions in particular, and those who endeavour to uproot religion altogether—literature in general has acquired a tinge, which affects, more or less, nearly all works, even though not professedly on religious subjects; and the opponents of these two parties, seek, in like manner, to stamp on their works the impress and seal of their body, and they endeavour to influence, through them, the manner of thinking of their readers, even in religious matters. The people of Italy have always been accustomed to consider every thing in a Catholic view; and the absence of such parties has also produced the absence of that character which has marked the productions of other countries, and which has insinuated into all literature the peculiar tenets of the authors of works, or the party to which they belong.

The publications in Italy may be divided, on religious sub-

jects, into two classes: the first comprises all those works which treat of the doctrines or mysteries of religion, whether in the severer form of theological treatises for the use of the clergy, or in the more familiar one of popular instructions; the second class contains those numerous works which tend to excite devotion, or to clothe it with expression. From these two classes we except, of course, works of general literature, history, and the arts, which do not partake of a religious character; and we except, likewise, works of periodical literature, the chief of which we intend to mention at present.

The first of these is the *Annali delle Scienze Religiose*, from the title of which, an idea may be formed of the subjects on which it treats. It is published quarterly, at Rome, under the direction of the Abate de Luca, assisted by several of his friends, and is conducted with much ability.

The *Propagatore Religioso*, is published at Turin. The subjects of this publication resemble those of the former work; and to the end of each number are generally appended literary notices.

The *Pragmologia Cattolica* resembles the latter; it is published at Lucca.

The *Memorie di Religione, di Morale e di Letteratura*, appears at Modena; the title sufficiently explains the kind of subjects which it selects.

With the exception of the *Annali*, these publications are monthly.

In Biblical Literature, the principal recent publications are:—

La Sacra Bibbia di Vence, giusta la quinta edizione, del Sigr. Drach, con atlante e carte: per cura del Prof. Bartolomeo Catena, Bibliotecario dell' Ambrosiana.—This work is not yet completed. Eight octavo volumes of it have appeared at Milan, and the remainder is in course of publication.

La Sacra Bibbia secondo la Volgata, colla Versione di Monsgr. A. Martini, e colla Spiegazione, &c. di L. J. Maistre de Sacq.—This work is also publishing at Milan, and will be completed in twenty volumes octavo.

La Sacra Bibbia seconda la Volgata: tradotta e con annotazioni di chiarata di Mgr. Martini. Florence. 3 vols. 8vo. 62f. 58c.

A new edition of St. Augustine's works is in course of publication at Venice, and is dedicated to his Holiness Gregory XVI. *Sancti Aurelii Augustini Opera, studio monachorum S. Mauri, post editionem, Parisiensem, Antverpiensem, et Venetam.* Three volumes, folio, have appeared.

Amongst the Theological Works may be noticed the following:—

Il Trionfo della Santa Sede, in 4 vols. 8vo. Venice.—This splendid work is from the pen of his Holiness the present Pontiff, and has appeared in several forms, at Venice and in other places.

Lectiones Theologicæ quas in Collegio Romano habebat Joannes Perrone, S. J.—This work is intended to form a complete course of modern and ancient dogmatical theology. The learned author is Pro-

fessor of Theology in the Roman College, which is under the direction of the Jesuits. Four volumes, octavo, have been printed, and a fifth is now in the press: three others will complete the work. We propose to give a more detailed account of this able work on a future occasion.

Opere Complete di Liguori. Venice, 16mo.—Volumes 67-8 have just been published.

Lezioni di Diritto Canonico; corredate di Note e d'Illustrazioni dal Prof. P. Vermiglioli. Perugia.—To be completed in 5 vols. 8vo. two of which have been printed.

Connected with Ecclesiastical History are the following:—

I Secoli Cristiani, ossia Storia de Cristianesimo, del Abate Ducreux. Vigevano. 4 vols. 8vo.

Two editions of the *Magnum Bullarium Romanum*, are in preparation at Rome. The first is to be a complete edition of the entire work; two parts are to be published every month, each of them to contain ten sheets: the subscribers' price will be two francs for each part. His Holiness has graciously ordered all the Archives to be opened to the editors, and has afforded them every encouragement in their undertaking. The other edition will contain merely the supplement, from 1758 to 1830, and will be completed in the same form and at the same price, with the foregoing. Two volumes have already been published.

The Biographical Works are chiefly—*Vita di S. Filippo Neri*, scritta da P. G. Bacci. Venice. 8vo. 3 vols. *Raccolta di Vite di Sancte Vergine e Vedove.* Turin. A new edition of the Life of St. Philip Neri is commenced at Rome.

The Books of Instruction are very numerous, but we can mention merely a few of them. *Collezioni di Opere di Religione distinta in tre Classi.* Vols. III, IV, V, VI and VII, have just been published at Venice; they contain—*Introduzione allo Studio della Religione*, del Cardinale Gerdil; *Testimonianze tratte della Filosofia di Bacone, Cartesio e Malebranche*; *Trattato di Bossuet della Cognizione di Dio e di se medesimo*; *Della esistenza di Dio*, di Fenelon. Each volume 87c.

Opere, di Segneri. Milan. To be complete in four large, or ten small volumes. It will form the most accurate edition of the works of this most eminent preacher.

Raccolta di Opere Sacri, per uso di ogni fedel Cristiano, publishing in parts at Leghorn.

Spiagazioni Evangeliche per tutto l'Anno, di G. Maggi. Milan. 2 vols. 4to.

Quadro del Cristianesimo. Ferrara. 1 vol 8vo.

Biblioteca per parrochi di Campagna. Venice. 8 vols. 8vo. Each volume 1fr. 74c.

Compendio della Dottrina Cristiana, exposito da Mgr. F. Bonesio, Vescovo di Bobbio. Cremona. 1 vol. 12mo.

Compendio del V. Testamento. 1 vol. 8vo. Venice.

Discorsi Morali tratti dai Santi Padri. Naples. 1 vol. 8vo.

Della vera Autorita de' Santi Padri, del Sacer. D. Zelo. Naples.

Elogi Sacri di D. Tonti. Naples. 1 vol. 8vo.

Ragionamento sul Culto di S. Filomena V.M. del Sacer. F. Storace. Genova. 1 vol. 8vo.

Dizionario Sacro-Liturgico, del Sacer. Giov. Dichlich. Venice. 4 vols. 8vo. Each vol. 2fr. 61c.

Omelie di Mons. G. M. Luvini, Vescovo di Pesaro. Florence. 1 vol. large 8vo. 3fr. 26c.

Dizionario Apostolico, per uso dei predicatori. Del P. Giacinto di Montargon. 18 vols. large 8vo. Venice.

Istruzioni Morali sopra la Dottrina Cristiana. Opera di Bresanvido. Naples, 6 vols. 8vo.

Our arrangements do not allow us, as yet, to enter as fully as we propose, into the ampler and richer department of German religious literature. This arises from no dearth of materials, which are easily accumulated, but rather from the obstacles in the way of arranging and methodising them in a satisfactory manner. On this account, we shall content ourselves with naming a few of the most important works which have been published since the commencement of the year.

Die Christliche Mystic. Christian Mystics. By J. Görres. Ratisbon and Landshut. Two volumes, 8vo. of this curious work appeared last year; the third is, we believe, in course of publication. It is a book calculated to produce a deep impression in Germany.

Friedrich Schlegel's Philosophische Vorlesungen aus den Jahren 1804-bis-1806. Aus dem Nachlass des Verewigten herausgegcb. von C. J. H. Windischmann. 2 Th. F. Schlegel's Philosophical Lectures delivered in the years 1804-6. Edited, from the immortal author's papers, by C. Windischmann. Bonn. These were early forerunners of those maturer views which have conferred immortality on the illustrious Schlegel. They treat of logic, metaphysics, and the history of the ancient philosophical systems. They are more formal and scholastic than any of his subsequent courses. The second volume, just published, (the first appeared last year,) contains, in addition, other fragments, theological and philosophical, of the illustrious Schlegel's later life. The editor, every way worthy of him, has added valuable notes to correct his opinions, held before he had the happiness to know the truth and embrace it; and has enriched the work with a valuable sketch of his philosophical career.

Lehrbuch des Kirchenrechts aller Christlichen Confessionen. Course of the Ecclesiastical Law of all Christian Persuasions. By Ferd. Walther. 8vo. Bonn. This is the seventh edition of this excellent, and now improved work. Its author, son-in law to the editor of the last-mentioned work, and professor at Bonn, has, we understand, lately received, from his Holiness, the Cross of St. Gregory.

An abridgment of Dr. Döllinger's excellent Church History, is coming out at Ratisbon and Landshut, under the title of *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte*. His larger work will be entitled to a fuller notice in the body of our Review.

Another elementary course has appeared at Bonn, with nearly the

same title, by Dr. Ritter, professor at Breslau: *Handbuch der Kirchenges.* Manual of Church History. 2d edition.

Geschichtliche Darstellung des Verhältnisses zwischen Kirche und Staat. Historical Exposition of the Relations between Church and State, from the foundation of Christianity to the latest times. By Prof. C. Rieffel. Vol. I, large 8vo. reaching to Justinian I. Mayence. An excellent work, and written in a very sound spirit.

Pragmatische Geschichte der deutschen National, Provinzial, und vorzüglichsten Diöcesanconcilien. History of the German national, provincial, and most important Diocesan Synods. By Dr. A. J. Binterim. Large 8vo. Mayence. Several volumes of this most important work have appeared, and add much to the great reputation their author already enjoyed, as a Christian antiquarian. The second volume brings down the collection only to the middle of the ninth century.

Die Christliche Moral. Christian Morality. By Dr. John Bat. Kirscher, an eminent professor of Tübingen. 2nd edit. Tübing.

Katholische-speculative Theologie. Vol. I.—A new and masterly defence of the Christian and Catholic religion, by the celebrated Dr. Brenner, in which he retracts some earlier inaccurate opinions.

Geschichte der Regierung Ferdinand des Ersten. History of the Reign of Ferdinand I. Compiled from edited and inedited sources, by F. B. Von Racholtz. Vol. VII. Vienna. The author of this celebrated and important work has had access to all the repositories of public documents in Austria. It is eminently a Catholic work, and deserves a fuller attention than this place allows.

An excellent pamphlet, proving the necessity of a visible church, has been published, under the title of *Leib der Göttlichen Offenbarung.* The body of Divine Revelation. We may also notice, that a powerful reply has appeared, at Mayence, to attacks made by Marheincke and Nitrah, upon Mühler's Symbolik.

MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE.

Europe.

AUSTRIAN DOMINIONS.—A legacy of about £41,000 sterling has been left for the foundation of a college at Verona, to be placed under the direction of the members of the Society of Jesus. The Austrian government has consented to this application of the bequest, and the college will soon be opened. The son of Prince Canosa, and another young nobleman of the same city, have lately entered the novitiate of the order in Rome.

The inhabitants of Milan are actively employed in raising funds for a new cathedral, in honour of their holy patron, St. Charles Borromeo. The plan of Professor Charles Amati has been selected; and the

cathedral is to occupy the site of the present Church of St. Mary of the Servites, which is dedicated to St. Charles. The city has undertaken to pay the expenses of demolishing the present church, of clearing the ground, and erecting the monument, and has, further, subscribed the sum of £12,500 towards the new building. It is expected that the work will commence next year at latest. The other expenses will be defrayed by the parochial administration of the old church, and by a subscription which was opened in the spring of this year.

A few months ago, M. Lezi, curate of St. Mary's in the above city, established an asylum for the infirm in his parish. His example was imitated by other parishes, and by the assistance of the authorities, four hospitals have been founded. The last of them was opened on the 30th of April, under the patronage of St. Charles Borromeo.

The Catholic papers mention two conversions during the last year at Vienna. Louis d'Or, a native of Berlin, and formerly professor in the Royal Academy of Saxony, and Dr. G. C. Bunger, one of the most famous Protestant preachers, formerly of Dresden, and lately of Bautzen, made their profession of faith in the hands of Cardinal Ostini, Nuncio at Vienna, during the course of the year.

The *Swabian Mercury* has the following: "The Brothers of Mercy have established in the whole Austrian Dominions twenty-nine hospitals for the sick. It is calculated that during six years one hundred thousand sick have entered them; and amongst these many Jews and persons not of the Catholic faith, or even of the Austrian nation."

HUNGARY.—The new cathedral at Erlaw has lately been opened. It is three hundred feet in length, and one hundred and sixty-eight in breadth at the transept. The front consists of eight large columns, surmounted by three colossal statues of the three virtues. In the interior are forty-two pilasters and thirty-six columns, all of marble, and the pavement is one entire beautiful mosaic. The building of this cathedral was determined on, when the cholera appeared in 1831, and it has been completed in six years.

In the whole kingdom of Hungary, of an extent of 6,000 square miles, no lunatic asylum existed until lately. This important work has been undertaken by Count Paul de Nadasdy, bishop of Waitzen. He purchased for the sum of nearly £6,000 the old military academy, and made it over to the province to which he belongs, to be converted into an extensive lunatic asylum. In addition, he assigned a large annual revenue for its support; and one of the Chapter, the Canon Gasparik, has given about £600 for the same purpose.

CROATIA.—Monsig. Alexander d'Algovich, Bishop of Agram, lately gave a sum of 60,000 florins for the establishment of an orphan house in the city of Posega. We have now to announce the death of this venerable prelate. He was born in 1760, and on account of his great services to the Church and his country, was nominated bishop in 1830. On the 18th of March, he was found with his breviary in his hand, having died suddenly of apoplexy. As he died intestate, one-third of his property will go to the government, another to the poor, and another to his heirs-at-law.

VENICE.—The last Doge of Venice, Manini, left a legacy of 110,000 ducats for the foundation of a school and asylum for destitute children, who were to be instructed in different trades. This money could not be applied, on account of the various political changes in that city; but by the exertions of the Cardinal Patriarch, the good work has at length been realised. The children are clothed, fed, and instructed, both in their trades and, above all, in religion, and frequent examinations keep up their emulation, while their morals are closely guarded. From the same bequest, a similar institution for young girls has been formed.

BAVARIA.—A royal order has lately been published at Munich, commanding that all carriages shall stop on meeting the processions with the Viaticum. The order has been communicated to the officers of the household, with the understanding that it is to extend to royal carriages, even when conveying the members of the royal family; and to the foreign ambassadors, to be by them made known to foreigners visiting that city.

The church of All Saints, at Munich, is almost completed. The entire ceiling, and a great portion of the walls, have been painted in fresco, by Henry Hess. All agree in describing his performance as a master-piece, both of sentiment and execution. It is in the style of the early masters, enriched with gilding, in addition to the brightest colouring. The principal paintings have been engraved on stone by the skilful hand of Schreiner. The church of St. Lewis (*Ludwigskirche*) is so far advanced, that the celebrated Cornelius has begun his magnificent frescos, representative of the articles of the creed. (See above, vol. i. p. 457.) In the course of last summer, he finished the upper portion of his Last Judgment. At the same time, under his direction, the Evangelists and Fathers of the Church were painted on the ceiling of the transept. The church of the Blessed Virgin (*Die Maria-Hülfs-Kirche*), in the suburb of Du, in the same city, draws near its completion. It is entirely in the old German style, the entrance being through a tower at the front. Its interior decoration chiefly consists of the splendid painted windows presented by the king. The designs are chiefly by Hess, and the execution, which rivals in splendour the finest performances of ancient times, has been conducted on a process perfectly new. The Basilica of St. Boniface is a perfect copy of the ancient Roman Basilicas, and is rapidly rising from its foundations. The apsis is nearly finished. The church will be a parish church, and one of the noblest among the splendid erections of the present king. It is divided into five aisles, like the churches of St. Paul and St. John Lateran in Rome. The columns are sixty-six in number, each of one block, and the expense of each is calculated at four thousand dollars. The entire expense of this church will be defrayed from the king's private purse. Above the columns will be painted a series of pictures representing the propagation of Christianity. The artist selected for this work is Henry Hess.

The Sisters of Charity, who have been established five years at Munich, have been lately taken under the king's special protection. His Majesty has secured to them a grant of public money towards the

erection of a new house, to supply any deficiency in the public subscription which has been opened for them. By a minute account, which has been published, it appears that in the hospital of Munich, a saving of 12,000 florins (about £1200) has been effected by their administration in one year. In one department of the establishment, in which twenty patients were kept at an expense of 7,000 florins, between thirty and forty can now be supported at one-third of the expense.

At the repeated instances of the inhabitants of Tüssen, the king has restored the Franciscan convent in their city. On the 29th of April, a solemn festival was celebrated for this purpose, which was attended by the magistracy, the public officers, and the most respectable inhabitants of the town and neighbourhood, in which public thanksgivings were offered up for an event considered by all a public benefit.

A commission has just been appointed at Munich to provide for the introduction of uniformity in classical works all over the kingdom. The Bishop of Augsburg, Mgr. de Richarz, is president, and the other members consist of the directors of the Catholic and Protestant colleges of Munich and Augsburg, and the members of the supreme council of ecclesiastical affairs and public instruction of both communions. Its first sitting was held on the 28th of March. The advantages of the measure are said to be very considerable, and it is hoped that the plan will work well.

RUSSIA.—Towards the beginning of this year, an Imperial Ukase was published, by which all Catholic natives of the Western-Provinces of Poland are excluded from all offices in the ministry, or in the higher departments of government, unless they have first served five years in Russia. Only such Poles as profess, or shall embrace, the Russo-Greek schism can enjoy equality of rights with the other subjects of the empire.

The Emperor of Russia has subscribed for a hundred copies of the German translation of the Talmud, which is to be published at Berlin by Dr. Pinner. The Emperor has allowed the work to be dedicated to him. It is to embrace the whole of the Talmud, in the original text of Jerusalem and Babylon, and will extend to twenty-eight volumes in folio. Dr. Pinner has spent five years in visiting Germany, England, France, Italy, Turkey, and Russia; and it is expected that his work will contain his observations on the moral and political situation of the Jews in those countries, as this has been an especial object of his attention and study.

PRUSSIA.—The provincial States of Westphalia (the *Landtag*) have, within these few months, again voted an unanimous address to the king, entreating the abolition of the law which we have before had occasion to mention (vol. ii. p. 180), whereby Catholic soldiers are obliged to attend Protestant service (the *Kirchenparaden*.) "The whole country," says our account, "nobility, burgesses, and peasants, desire to be put to an obligation, which places our children's conduct upon the rack."

Bonn.—Professor Braun, of this university, and Dr. Elvenich, have proceeded to Rome, to advocate the orthodoxy of the late professor Dr. Hermes. As, however, the question respecting the Hermesian system of theology is at this moment agitating the whole of Catholic Germany, we shall take a future opportunity, when it shall have been more fully considered at Rome, to enter into it at length.

BELGIUM.—The continuators of the Bollandists are appointed. They are the Reverend Fathers L. Boone, J. Van der Moeren, and Coppens: they are assisted by several young disciples.

HOLLAND.—We are in hopes, before long, to present our readers with a detailed and interesting account of the state of religion in this country. And we have no doubt that every Catholic will be consoled and edified by the narrative. At present we will only mention two or three circumstances. The Catholics of Ysendyk, in Zealand, have received from the government a grant of 15,000 florins, towards building a new church, which is to cost 40,000. Considerable sums have been subscribed in Ghent and other towns. The very ancient church of Our Lady at Macstricht, which has long been used as a military dépôt, has been restored to the Catholics, to replace that of St. Nicholas, which will be demolished at the expense of the city; and the Catholics will reimburse the expenses already disbursed for the repairs of their new church by the military commission. All parties agree in praising the conduct of the government in this transaction: many Protestants have contributed towards liquidating the expense incurred by the Catholics.

SWEDEN.—We wish our limits allowed us to give at length the beautiful and moving letter published by the German religious journals, from the Vicar Apostolic Studach at Stockholm, to one of the editors of the excellent *Religionsfreund*, of Würzburg. In it he gives an account of the outward completion of his new church, the first built in that city, and appeals to the charity of his brethren for the necessary funds; as after 20,000 florins have been laid out upon it, there is still a debt of 4,000. Besides the vicar, there are only two other clergy, one who shares with him the parochial duty, while the other takes care of a considerable orphan establishment.

ROME.—With the deepest regret, we announce the death of his Eminence Cardinal Weld. This melancholy event took place at Rome, about half-past one on the afternoon of Monday, April the 10th. Until within a few days before his death, no alarming symptoms appeared, and every hope was entertained of his recovery. But his complaint, unexpectedly, took a serious turn, and earthly hope was soon rendered unavailing. His relatives gathered round his bed-side, and his last act of consciousness was to give his blessing to those to whom he had ever been so tenderly attached. His calm and peaceful death formed a fitting close to a life spent in charity and good will towards all. When the news of his death was announced, Rome was filled with sorrow. The poor whom he had relieved, the orphans whom he had cherished, the communities over which he had watched, and the rich by whom he had been honoured, crowded to his funeral. His brother

cardinals assembled in his church of St. Marcellus, at a solemn high mass. But amongst the multitude of rich and poor, was one whose high station and unaffected grief rendered him more conspicuous than the rest. The Holy Father attended, and his countenance wore an expression of parental sorrow, which sought relief in tears, and choked his utterance, when he attempted to pronounce the last absolution over the illustrious defunct. To mark more strongly their love and regard for his memory, his relatives caused the funeral obsequies to be again performed in the Church of the Orphans, whose generous and zealous protector he had ever been. The church was hung with black in the most costly style, and before the altar a catafalque was raised, on which were inscriptions to commemorate the virtues of the deceased and the sorrow of his family. The Requiem of Mozart was selected, as the most appropriate expression of sorrow and supplication; and no trouble or expense was spared to give effect to the deep and solemn original. All the English residents were invited, and the church was filled to excess; but throughout there reigned a reverential stillness. The execution was worthy of the beautiful composition, and did honour to the talent and reputation of the performers, and to the reputation of their city. The funeral oration was pronounced by the Very Rev. Dr. Wiseman, who traced in it the chief events of the life, and the numerous virtues, of the Cardinal. It has been published in Rome in English and Italian. We trust that a monument will soon be erected in this country, to the virtues, excellence, and merits of our lamented and venerable countryman.

His Eminence Cardinal Galeffi, Chamberlain to the Holy See, and Archpriest of St. Peter's, died at Rome on the 18th June. Although one of the best provided for among the cardinals, and though he had enjoyed his dignity thirty-four years, he did not leave wherewith to defray the charges of his funeral, nor to pay a single legacy. His entire income, after his own very moderate expenses, went to the poor. We need not add that his demise is extensively lamented.

Requiescant in pace!

The *Accademia di Religione Cattolica* has recommenced its assemblies, at the University, under the august patronage of His Holiness, and the auspices of a large number of the cardinals. The opening lecture was delivered on the 27th of April by Cardinal Polidori. The third paper was read, on the 15th of June, by the Very Rev. Dr. Wiseman, on the state of Protestantism in England, principally with regard to the doctrines on church authority; and other papers will be read until September, on subjects connected with the interests or state of religion in different parts of the world.

On the 19th of May, His Holiness held a secret consistory at the Vatican, in which he nominated Monsig. L. Amat, Archbishop of Nice, born at Cagliari in 1796, Cardinal of the Order of Priests. His Eminence received, on the same day, the usual congratulations from the Sacred College, the Diplomatic Body, &c.

On the same occasion, His Holiness nominated two archbishops, and twenty-one bishops, to different churches in France, Germany, America,

and Italy. Amongst them were the new Bishops of Belgrade and Semendria (United); Paz and S. Juan de Cuyo in the New States of South America; and Sonora in North America.

A supplement to the Roman paper was lately filled with a list of the public works, connected with arts, that were executed in Rome by order of His Holiness, during the course of last year. They embrace sacred and profane monuments, paintings, and other interesting objects.

Rome has not been this year without its usual proportion of interesting conversions. Besides several English and Americans, we believe ourselves authorized to reckon the eminent German architect Knapp, who has devoted several years to designing and engraving the early churches of Rome. He has been preceded by a few months, in his return to the bosom of the Catholic Church, by the distinguished landscape-painter Tierlinck.

An unusual number of British prelates have visited Rome this year, on business connected with their sees, or from motives of health: viz. two Irish bishops, Drs. Brown and Higgins; two English vicars-apostolic, Drs. Walsh and Griffiths; and two from our American dependencies, Dr. Mac Donnell from Trinidad, and Dr. Fleming of Newfoundland. To these we must add the Very Rev. W. Ullathorne from Australia, whose accounts of that rising country have deeply interested the ecclesiastical authorities. Thus is religious unity maintained among Catholics from the uttermost bounds of earth, through their communion with the Holy See.

ASIA.

SYRIA.—Monsig. Auvergne, Archbishop of Iconium, and apostolic delegate in Syria, died in September 1836, at Diarbekir, on his journey to the faithful at Bagdad, whither he had been sent by the Holy See. He was only forty-two years of age. His grand vicar, M. Guinoir, died at the same city, and in the same month, aged thirty-four. Both were from the diocese of Nismes, and their loss will be severely felt by that portion of the Church.

INDIA.—M. G. R. Fazio, a Capuchin, Bishop of Tiposa, with two companions, one a German, the other a British subject, left Rome a few months ago, to proceed to Calcutta, by the Red Sea. We have been favoured with a copy of the letter of the respected prelate to the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda, giving an account of his journey; and we know not which most to admire, their courage in undertaking such a long and perilous journey, or the resignation which he expresses in the midst of his misfortunes. The letter is as follows:

“We left Cairo, and, after a painful journey through the desert, we arrived at Suez, where we embarked in an English vessel, on the 6th of February. Our voyage was favourable, until four in the morning of the 11th, which was the first Sunday in Lent. Suddenly the vessel struck on a rock, and, awaking, we heard the fearful cries—‘We are perishing, we are lost!’ Every means was tried to clear the vessel, but all in vain. Our distress and our prayers reached the throne of God; and at last, about mid-day, a small Turkish vessel,

which was passing at a small distance, came to our aid ; but there was room for no more than six of us, as the little vessel was already much loaded. It was resolved that some should embark, and sail to Geddah for assistance. As, however, it was twenty-five miles distant, the party did not arrive till five in the evening. Boats were immediately sent off, expecting to reach about midnight ; but towards evening, the vessel split, and the passengers took refuge in the two small boats belonging to it. The darkness of the night, the agitation of the sea, and the smallness of the boats, filled them with fresh apprehension. About midnight, they fell in with one of the boats sent to their relief, and were thus providentially preserved. The other boats saved a small part of the goods. The crew and passengers were all saved, but nearly every thing else was destroyed. We lost all, even our passage-money, which the captain said he was, by the English laws, not bound to return in cases of shipwreck. Our health has suffered, and all of us have been unwell. Last night I had a violent attack of fever. The will of God be done ! We intend to resume our journey, as soon as we are a little recovered."

Geddah, Feb. 15, 1837.

Another letter mentions, that from Geddah they would proceed to Mocha.

SOUTH AMERICA.

One hundred and fifty Franciscans lately embarked at Genoa, for the new provinces of South America. The expenses of their voyage will be defrayed by the governments of the states to which they are going.

BUENOS AYRES.—Six religious of the Order of Jesus, who left Cadiz in May 1836, have arrived at Buenos-Ayres. They were received with ringing of bells, and fire-works, and the streets through which they were to pass were covered with flowers. They were conducted to the church of St. Ignatius, which belonged to their former college. The government has paid all the expenses of their voyage, and it is expected that much good will result from their labours, and that they will shortly found schools and other useful establishments. The good bishop wishes them also to give missions in the country. Already, it is said, they have added eight thousand souls to the flock of Jesus Christ. In their favour the government has published a decree, in which it is mentioned that, as the six religious have dedicated themselves to the service of the people, and as it is now time to restore an order, the memory of whose innumerable services in former times, to religion and the state, is but fresh amongst the people, who now form the Argentine republic ;—it is decreed that their ancient college shall be restored to them, that they may there live in community, and receive their European brethren according to their institute, and open the course of education approved by the government, which will also increase their buildings if required. This order to be communicated to the bishop, and all the usual officers, and be published in the official register.

NORTH AMERICA.

CINCINNATI.—We extract the following from a letter, dated April the 4th, addressed to two professors of the College of Propaganda:—"Our religion has lately been attacked on every side, and the Protestants assault us with such violence, that plainly proves how little they will allow to others of that religious liberty, which they claim for themselves. There has been a celebrated controversy between Mon. Purcell, our bishop, and the Protestant clergyman, Mr. Campbell. The latter began the contest by inserting some attacks on Catholicity in the public prints, and challenging any of our clergy to a disputation. Mgr. Purcell appeared in the arena to defend his injured faith, and proceeded so well, that even the Protestant journals award him the victory." We learn with pleasure that a magnificent set of various articles of plate has been presented to his lordship, in testimony of his late services to religion.

LAKE SUPERIOR.—We hasten to present our readers with the following account of the zeal and energy of a single individual, and his wonderful success in the conversion of souls. M. Frederic Baraga was born of a noble family, at Laibac in Illyria, and was ordained priest in 1823. After much opposition, he was allowed to follow his inclination to labour in the distant vineyard of America, for which he left Europe in 1830. At first, he laboured on the borders of the Red Lake and River, and then removed to Arbre-Croche, where he remained till the end of 1833. During this last period, he heard from the traders in peltries, that further to the north was a people of gentle and open disposition, who had never heard of the gospel. From the new Bishop of Detroit, Mgr. de Rezé, he obtained leave to devote himself to the service of the Otchipwais, who are scattered over the shores and islands of Lake Superior. Their language resembles that of the Otawais, amongst whom he had already preached, and they live by fishing and the chase. Their idolatry is gross, but not barbarous; but, excepting the English factories, or the Canadians, they knew nothing of the Europeans. To them he set forth, amidst the difficulties of winter and a long journey, early in 1834. He applied for hospitality to those Canadian traders who had married amongst the Indians. The naturally delicate and intelligent minds of their wives were pleased with the beauty of the gospel; and their conversion soon led to that of their children. His success produced a strong reaction. The elders were afraid of the influence of the French, (as they term all foreigners,) and they complained, that the young and imaginative minds of their people were led astray. Thanks be to God, they did not persecute, nor threaten. Each night till midnight was spent in superstitious invocations, accompanied with loud shouts and the beating of drums. For a while, the progress of the gospel was delayed: but the missionary edified all by his patient and gentle conduct; and the conversion of one of their leading men led to that of many others. After fourteen months, he had converted most of the people, and had rendered Christianity respected, by all. Its good effects were soon evident over a large tract of country; the conduct of

the people became more edifying, and their clothing and manner of life was suited to the improvement in their moral and social condition. Many of them have learned to read, and a few even to write; it is curious that they evince less talent for the arts of industry, than for those of intellect. About a year ago he was obliged to return to Europe, to print some books for his people, and to obtain some fellow-labourers. He came to Paris, and Providence led him to the editor of the *Univers*, a Catholic paper, to whom he communicated this account. By their help, and by the assistance of the Association for the Propagation of the Faith, he was enabled, with great labour on his part, to print three thousand copies, in two different dialects, of two small works which he had brought with him, with the approbation of his bishop. The first is entitled "*Otchipiwie-animie-masinaigan*;" it contains prayers for morning, evening, mass, the wants of life, the litanies and canticles for the festivals. The other "*Jesus obima di siwin ama akin*," contains the life of our Lord Jesus Christ, taken from the gospels, so as to serve either as a history or a catechism. These works were printed in Roman characters, according to a system invented by himself. The Association ordered a great number of the copies to be bound at its expense. At the end of last February, he visited the Holy Father, who was pleased to hear him relate all the history of his mission, and granted him extraordinary powers. Cardinal Franson supplied him with money for the books and other wants of his Church. From Rome, he passed through Laibac; but death, in his absence, had deprived him of both his parents. He found there a priest to accompany him to America, as well as a young artisan to instruct the Indians in the arts, and his own sister, who will educate the children. At Vienna, the Emperor and Empress heard with delight all his accounts; and Prince Metternich invited him to his house. M. Baraga took advantage of the opportunity, to beg him to assist the Leopoldine Institute, formed to assist the poor Catholic Sces in North America, and he hopes that he has succeeded in obtaining the minister's support for it. He then returned to Paris; and though his bishop is on his way to Europe, and wishes to see him, his zeal is so great, that he prepared to return, and was intending to leave Paris at the end of May.

EXHIBITION AT ST. PETER'S COLLEGE, PRIOR PARK.—The annual examination of the students belonging to this extensive and superb establishment, took place during three days of the last week, when the subjects of study comprised Moral and Dogmatic Theology; Ethics; Logic; Ideology; Sacred Literature; and the Holy Liturgy; Sacred History; Rhetoric; Mathematics; seven classes of the Classics, Greek and Roman, including every author of high repute in verse and prose; English; French; Italian; History; Geography; Mapping; Chronology; Elocution; Writing; Music and Drawing. On Tuesday morning, a considerable number of ladies and gentlemen were invited to *The Exhibition*, which was intended to present a synoptical review of the progress and attainments of each class, more intelligible and entertaining to a mixed auditory than a mere attendance at the exami-

nations could have afforded. This exhibition consisted of *memoriter* recitations of some of the finest passages in the Greek and Roman Classics; of translations from the same; of original compositions, in prose and verse, in the same languages; of recitations and dialogues in French and Italian; dissertations on literary subjects, sustained by the students, one of which was an analysis of the rules laid down in Horace's Art of Poetry; of specimens of geographical mapping, and of drawing. This lasted from eleven in the morning till nearly four o'clock; but this lengthened period was so agreeably diversified by vocal and instrumental music by the pupils, assisted by Mr. Henry Field and a professional band, that not the smallest feeling of ennui or fatigue was experienced by any of the company, but the highest delight and admiration were expressed on all hands at the diligence and zeal of the professors, which must have been so laudably seconded by industry, application, and talent on the part of the students. It was not merely the knowledge of the grammar and idioms of the French and Italian displayed by the young gentlemen, many of whom were yet below their teens, but the pure and correct accent with which those languages were pronounced, that drew down the most flattering compliments from the strangers present, of whom a large proportion were, from long residence abroad, and intimate acquaintance with those languages, perfectly competent to give a correct opinion. The exhibition terminated by the distribution of prizes by the Rt. Rev. Dr. Baines, who presided. These consisted, 1st, of *honours*—viz. collars of blue and red ribbons with gold crosses, with which those who were fortunate enough to obtain *first certificates* of merit, were invested; and 2nd of *presents*—viz. standard works in superb bindings. The exhibition took place in the New Gallery of Fine Arts, belonging to the Great West Wing of the College.

In the evening a large and elegant party, consisting of between 300 and 400 of the principal nobility and gentry of the city and neighbourhood, in addition to the parents and friends of the pupils, attended to witness the second part of the exhibition, which consisted of dramatic performances, from no less than five plays, three of which were in English from Shakspeare, viz. Julius Cæsar, Richard II, and Henry IV; one Sacred Drama in Italian, from Metastasio, the recognition of Joseph in Egypt by his brethren; and the very diverting Comedy of Molière—*Le Mariage forcé*, in French; the whole of which were enacted by the pupils alone, without any professional assistance whatever, the dresses, armour, and other "properties" being exceedingly rich and appropriate. The company assembled, by invitation, at six o'clock, and the carriage entry was directed to be made through the new great gates,* about a quarter of a mile below the building. Following this road the company were brought to the foot of the noble

* On these gates is placed the following motto, intended, we presume, to intimate that it is the wish of the principals to stand aloof from all those party questions, either in religion or politics, which have the slightest tendency to disturb the Chris-

flight of steps,† leading to the principal mansion, the interior of which was devastated by a calamitous fire last year. At the top of the first flight, they presented their cards, and, at the summit of the second, were received by the Rt. Rev. Dr. Baines and the very Rev. Dr. Brindle. Tea was immediately served in the vestibule of the principal mansion, which was sufficiently restored, since the conflagration, to be applied to that purpose. From the hour of arrival to the commencement of the performances, the gay assemblage were occupied in traversing the magnificent grounds and gardens, which are not only laid out in admirable taste, but stored with an immense collection of the choicest flowers and shrubs. At half-past seven, the whole party proceeded to the exquisitely classic "Academic Theatre," in the new west wing, where the performances commenced with an overture by a professional band, and a remarkably playful and appropriate prologue delivered in character, with excellent point, by Master Bateman, a boy of very tender age, but who has greatly distinguished himself throughout the entire examination in every branch of study and accomplishment. The plays above named then followed, and drew down repeated thunders of applause from the elegant auditory; nor were these tributes unmerited, for during the whole of these performances, some of which were in foreign languages, and severely taxing both the memory and the judgment, not a single trip, hitch, or failure occurred, among the forty students who took part in the five representations; while the adaptation of look, tone, manner, and gesture to the scene, gave evidence of a thorough comprehension of the text and character. Some idea may be formed of the labour undergone on the occasion, when we state that though the performances commenced punctually at half-past seven, they extended, without interruption, to five hours after that

tian and social charities, or to interrupt those literary pursuits which can only be successfully followed in tranquil and peaceful retirement:

Lest thoughtless steps these sacred shades profane,
 Stranger! thy entrance for awhile refrain.
 Know, in the shelter of this calm retreat,
 Science and sacred lore have fixed their seat,
 And gentle poetry—by whom the spot,
 Where Pope once sung may never be forgot:
 If then thy soul these peaceful genii loves,
 'Tis thine to wander in their silent groves;
 But, if thy breast the meaner passions fire—
 If strife political, sectarian ire—
 Possess thy soul, oh! turn thy steps away,
 Or check these dire emotions for the day!
 Whom wisdom loves—whom virtue calls her own—
 Who wishes well to all—and ill to none—
 To him the muse---the sage---a welcome send---
 Stranger! if such thou art, proceed a friend.

† The classic embellishments of this splendid structure have received many additions from the Hound-street collection, a sale of which took place some time ago—among the rest a superb pediment and numerous statues, now occupying the several pedestals right and left of the great flight of steps.

period, and closed with a neat epilogue very smartly and gracefully delivered by Master Charles De Aguado. The kind and bountiful hospitalities of the establishment, throughout the evening, relieved, in a great degree, the extreme heat and pressure produced by so numerous an assemblage; the supplies of negus, lemonade, confectionery, &c. being frequent and abundant. The company broke up, highly delighted with one of the most tasteful, interesting, and attractive recreations which the whole Bath season has afforded.—*Bath Herald*.

EXHIBITION AT OSCOTT COLLEGE.—The exhibition of the Pupils at the Roman Catholic College of Oscott, for Midsummer, 1837, took place on Tuesday last, at three o'clock, in the presence of about four hundred persons. A number of individuals who had been specially invited, dined in the Library of the *old*, whence they proceeded to the Exhibition Room in the *new* College, which was nearly finished, and was decorated tastefully with laurels and wreaths of flowers for the purpose. The Exhibition commenced with the Overture to "Guy Mannering," exceedingly well executed by six young amateurs. The Prologue by Mr. Alfred Greenep, his own composition, was well adapted to the occasion. The recitations from Cowper, Byron, Chambers, and others, were recited, some of them with much humour, particularly "The Escape of a Pig," by Miss Mitford, recited by Charles Rebello, and the "Weatherglass and Weathercock," by W. Trafford. The speakers and declaimers were generally younger than those we heard on the same occasion last year, and the pieces recited were adapted more to juvenile aptitudes. There were six pieces, the compositions of the reciters, varying of course in merit, but all highly creditable to their juvenile authors, Masters Longman, Mac Carthy, Spink, Greenep, and Fagan. In the intervals between the speeches there were glees and music by the pupils. A debate, exceedingly well kept up, followed the recitations—the subject, the respective merits, as heroes, of Alexander Magnus, and Thomas Thumb: there was much wit, humour, and *jeu de mots* in the dialogue. Some scenes from Molière succeeded, in which the merit of Master Farrell was very conspicuous, exhibiting an excellent conception of his subject. To the other four performers it would be difficult to do separate justice. On the whole the scene was a most animating and agreeable one, and spoke the vast improvement in the modern system of education over that of past times. The Examinations in Philosophy, Rhetoric, Poetry, the Classics, Sacred Literature, Mathematics, and Arithmetic, took place on the 8th, 9th, and 12th instant. The prizes of medals and books were delivered after the exhibition on Monday; and, from the accounts given by the superior, were exceedingly well merited by the pupils, some of whom carried off no less than three for their proficiency in three separate branches of college acquirements.—*From the Staffordshire Examiner*.—Another report informs us that, among those who carried off Collegiate honours, Mr. Charles Eyston, eldest son of C. Eyston, Esq., of Hendred, held a most distinguished place. Having finished his academical course, and being about to leave *Alma Mater* for the last time, the Rev. President took the opportunity, before he

conferred the medal, of enumerating some of his many good qualities, both that merit might not go unrewarded, and that his school-mates might be stimulated to follow so bright an example. The plaudits of his fellow collegians convinced us that the eulogium was not exaggerated.

[ADVERTISEMENT.]

PROPOSED CATHOLIC LIBRARY IN LONDON.—An attempt is now being made to establish, in London, a Catholic Library, upon principles which we think will entitle it to the cordial support of every one who wishes well to the cause of our Holy Religion. It is not to be denied that great efforts have been made, and are now making, among Protestants, not only to shake the faith of Catholics, but as much as is possible, by misrepresentations of every kind, to prejudice the public mind. And it is equally undeniable, that, hitherto, Catholics have scarcely even defended themselves. It has been their part to suffer with patience and resignation; but assuredly the time has now arrived when it is their duty to take *every* peaceable means in their power, not only of repelling the calumnies of their enemies, but also of vindicating their own opinions—of showing, in short, that they are able “to give a reason for the Faith that is in them.” Unquestionably preaching is the best method of propagating the true faith; but the difficulty has always been to get over the prejudices of Protestants sufficiently to induce them to attend our chapels in a sincere and inquiring spirit. We trust there is less difficulty in inducing them to *read*, and the object of the proposed association is to offer them this opportunity gratuitously. We understand that sixteen clergymen of the London district have already given the undertaking their cordial support. The sanction of the Bishop is intended to be solicited, and an appeal will then be made to the Laity in general. We subjoin a copy of the resolutions which are proposed to be submitted to a general meeting, and we most cordially wish the undertaking the success it so well deserves:—

“*Resolutions proposed to be submitted to a Public Meeting of Catholics.*—Resolved,—*First*: That the Protestant inhabitants of this Metropolis are for the most part in a state of total ignorance as to the real principles and tenets of the Catholic Faith, and that, in consequence, the most derogatory and incorrect opinions are entertained and propagated, even by the best educated classes of society, not only of our holy Religion itself, but also of the understanding and morals of those who profess it.—*Second*: That this lamentable state of affairs is attributable not only to the active and interested misrepresentations of some of our opponents, but also to a want among our laity of the means of making a united and well-directed appeal to the candour and good sense of their fellow-countrymen.—*Third*: That it appears to this meeting that one of the best methods of promoting a knowledge of the truth, and of that Christian charity which is so essential to the well-being of society, is, *first*, to establish a Catholic Library, from whence the proprietors may supply their Protestant friends with the *gratuitous* loan of approved works, in the English and French Languages, Catholic Reviews, Magazines, &c., &c.; *Secondly*, so to construct the Rules of the Associ-

ation as to make it a means of producing a greater degree of co-operation and personal acquaintance with each other, and with Catholic affairs, than has hitherto existed among the members of the Catholic body in London and its vicinity.—*Fourth*: That in order to carry these objects into effect, it is expedient to form a Society which shall consist of all Catholics, who, having been elected by ballot, shall pay an annual subscription of ten shillings.—*Fifth*: That the Society shall be governed by officers elected annually in the usual manner.”

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

Bertrand, a Tragedy. By S. B. Harper, Esq. London. Fraser, 1837.

THE scene of this tragedy is laid in Madrid, and the subject is a plot entered into by some Castilian nobles to dethrone the reigning king, Ferdinand, and raise in his stead his queen, Joan, who had been living for some time in a convent, as a nun. Lopez, one of the conspirators, at the same time that he seems all loyalty to the king, determines in his own mind, if their designs against the king should succeed, to marry Queen Joan, and thus elevate himself to the regal dignity. A young noble, named Bertrand, who is betrothed to Lopez' sister, is ardently loved by Joan, and is on that account hated by Lopez, who attempts to get rid of him by assassination; but a feeling for his sister, Mariana, forbids him to repeat his attempt—at least until he effects a change in her affections, which he tries to do by persuading her that Bertrand loves Queen Joan. For this purpose, he feigns having received a message from Joan, requesting Bertrand's attendance at the convent; and having thus sent him there, he informs his sister of Bertrand's errand, and advises her to follow him and be a witness of his visit to the convent. Her jealousy prompts her to conceal herself near the convent gate, within which she sees that Bertrand gains admittance; but before he enters, she overhears some fragments of his soliloquy, which she misconstrues so as to confirm her worst suspicions. So far Lopez succeeds. He next sends Bertrand on a pretended commission from Joan to the conspirators, and then obtains from the king a guard which seizes him immediately after he has delivered his message to the conspirators, and conducts him to Ferdinand, who condemns him to death. On the night before his execution, he encounters in his dungeon one of the conspirators, with whom he enters into conversation, and, from their mutual explanations, the dark designs of Lopez are made manifest to both.

The morning of the execution arrives, and Queen Joan, as if by magic, appears on the scaffold, on which a tumult is begun by the people, who shout “Long live Queen Joan.” She quells this commotion, on the condition that the king should pardon the criminals before him. He does so; but Mariana, whose nerves were so much shaken by the supposed infidelity of Bertrand, that she becomes insane, stabs her lover—and thus ends the tragedy.

We have space for only a very few remarks. The character of Mariana seems to us to have an excess of violence in it; and though, in the end, she is destined to sum up the story with a deed of blood, that deed, nevertheless, proceeds from madness, which very seldom occurs, unless the feelings of the patient are very sensitive and acute. This is precisely Mariana's case; and to fancy that a being of such feelings would be so indifferent to those of others, would be to suppose a thing more than improbable. When she upbraids her brother for his seeming indifference to the danger from assassination, to which Bertrand had been exposed, and from which he had just escaped, she finishes with these words:

"Then might'st thou feel a kind of gratitude,
That powerful majesty had missed its aim,
So as just at that then present instant
Eclipse the outbreakings of revenge. But hired,
Night-prowling, indiscriminate stabbers!
Why the man's no more mettle than an ass!"

And when he first tells her that Bertrand loves another, the sister addresses the brother thus:

"William!—Assassin!—Fiend!—What is thy name?
The Devil, not God, made thee! My Father's Son
A vile impostor!"

This passage leaves as bad an impression on our mind, of the charity of Mariana, as the one above does of the poetry of our author.

The most of the second scene is nothing but a wide field, in which the impudence of Lopez' servant, Vallos, is shown off, and the high-born conspirators are unhappily made to bear with it all, till his lacqueyship chooses to give it up. There is no meaning, no end to be attained in this, and we naturally conclude that it would have been better left unwritten. The second act is better managed than the first, and is the best, except the fourth; but one or two passages, such as the following, might be omitted to advantage:

"LOPEZ. Were I now to kill thee, sister, could'st think it love?"

MARIANA. So please my brother, I had rather he should not prove me.

LOPEZ. But could'st trust it, love?" &c.

The third act opens with a soliloquy of Joan, who, among some much better things, says, speaking of herself:

"Herbs and raw fruits her princely banquets make;
Cold, cold, hard stones, her velvet cushioned couch."

And addressing Mariana—

"The sun did shine at night, when thou wast born!"

We can understand how a princely banquet can be composed of herbs and raw fruits; but, in spite of all poetical licence, we are at a loss to conceive how "cold, cold, hard stones," can be brought to signify a "velvet cushioned couch;" and this is the first time we have heard of the sun shining in the night-time.

Act IV is rather long; but the poetry is very good throughout, and abounds with images. It commences with a soliloquy of Lopez, who, though of a cold, calculating nature, nearly akin to misanthropy, is yet, on this occasion, sensibly affected, and all his feelings are warmed into love for his kind, by contemplating the beauty and harmony of nature on a gay summer morning. The passage alluded to is one of the best written in the work, and does the author great credit.

After the pardon of Bertrand, in the fifth act, the following is used by Mariana, as an expression of endearment towards him:

“Oh Bertrand, darling! As the boa constrictor
Doth furl around, tight, tight its many coils,
My round long love hugged thee; oh! oh! how could'st
Thou throttle me? It would have kept thee warm.”

Now it strikes us, that if our poet, at the time he wrote this, had in his mind the nature of the serpent, or remembered the fable, in which the countryman, who meeting with one whose energies were paralyzed with cold, and taking it up to restore animation, by putting it into his bosom, did so to his own detriment,—we think he would not have employed this unfortunate simile, as he has fared no better with the image than the countryman did with the reality.

The principal defect of the work is a want of connexion, which becomes very apparent in Act V. There are a few improbabilities, such as the retention of Vallos by Lopez, who knowing his servant to be a villain and an eaves-dropper, nevertheless trusts him with a letter, containing a bribe to the lady Abbess of the Convent. The bribe (a diamond ring) excites the curiosity of Vallos, who, like many of the modern successors in his calling, bends the letter, and learns an important secret of his master's.

We make the foregoing remarks, merely to apprise the author of what he ought to guard against, if he should think of again coming forward as a candidate for fame. We would advise him to work hard, for there are, if taken individually, many passages of great beauty to be found in the work before us; and it is only the difficulty of producing a harmonized whole, that he will have to surmount the next time he comes before the public.

Essays, Literary and Political: by W. E. Channing. Glasgow, James Hedderwick and Son, 1837.—As an eloquent writer and original thinker, Dr. Channing has established a high reputation. Many of his views are profound; but he stumbles like a man in the dark, when he touches on the subject of the Catholic religion. With all his liberality and charity, he entertains silly prejudices against Catholicism, which must be ascribed to early education. The letter on Catholicism, has several striking passages; but it betrays, on the part of the author, an entire ignorance of the first principles of Christianity, and the constitution of the Christian Church.

Philosophy and Religion, with their Mutual Bearings comprehensively considered and satisfactorily determined on clear and scientific principles:

by William Brown Galloway, A.M. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1837.—In an age like the present, abounding with scepticism upon the subject of revealed religion, every attempt to connect philosophy and religion cannot fail to excite the interest of every believer in Christianity. Much evil, as Mr. Galloway observes in his preface, has resulted to philosophy and revealed religion from the want of a proper understanding of their mutual bearings; many ingenious men having in consequence been led into infidelity, and still more having had their belief injuriously affected; while, on the other hand, many religious men entertain a jealousy of philosophy. These evils he ascribes to the erroneous and ill-defined notions of moral and metaphysical philosophy which have hitherto prevailed, and to correct these is the object of his work, which he modestly says is “*a desideratum* both in philosophy and in religion.” But we quarrel not with Mr. Galloway for this high opinion of his own performance; which, notwithstanding some startling metaphysical dogmas, is a work of great merit.

Picturesque and Historical Recollections during a Tour through Belgium, Germany, France, and Switzerland: by M. O'Connor, Esq. London: Orr and Co. 1837.—Among the many books of travels through Germany and Switzerland that now are published, the above we find to be one of the most interesting, as well as filled with more liberal sentiments, with regard to the religions and customs of our continental neighbours, than such works ordinarily contain. The author, an Irishman, delights to draw comparisons between his own country and that of the Swiss:—“Both,” he says, “are peopled by a hardy race, who have, in most of the fields of battle in Europe, figured in the same ranks, won laurels, and reflected glory on their respective countries.” He amuses with his remarks on the stiffness and hauteur which aristocratic English families generally assume when travelling abroad, and which deservedly exclude them from the pleasures which the nobility of every other country derive from the intelligent conversation of mercantile tourists. He conveys instruction to the historian by his succinct description of the labours of the Irish monks, at the head of whom was Columba, who took up his residence in the Vosges Mountains, and founded several monasteries, which afterwards became celebrated for the number and value of the manuscripts which they contained; and he interests the admirers of the fine arts, by his very just remarks on the paintings of the old Flemish school, which he had an opportunity of visiting on his way through Holland. Our author visited Basle, where he of course went to the cathedral, in the churchyard of which is the tomb of Erasmus. He thus describes his visit:—

“We passed over a wooden bridge, six hundred feet in length, into Great Basle. Our first visit was to the cathedral; and as our guide had never heard the name of Erasmus, we were obliged to wander in quest of his tomb, but were repaid by the perusal of old monumental inscriptions, in which we recognised the learning and classic elegance of the old university. Many a pious sentiment elevated us to the contemplation of futurity. Many a holy text pointed to the vanities of all sublunary enjoyments; and many an epitaph, in the medium between

exaggerated praise and moderate eulogy, excited us to the imitation of the virtues of those to whom they were inscribed. At length, we desecrated the bust of Erasmus. His epitaph is written in a style of simplicity and elegance characteristic of the inhabitant of the tomb beneath. His mortal remains are there deposited; but his wit no longer animates, his genius no longer illumines, his learning no longer ennobles, his true sense of religion no longer chastens the university. Ignorance and illiberality have fixed their residence in those once celebrated abodes of science and toleration. The Reformers have banished the Catholic religion from Great Basle. The free exercise of it is excluded from all places of religious worship, and is connived at in Little Basle, to the great inconvenience of the Catholic population of the other town."

Mammon; or, Covetousness the sin of the Christian Church: by John Harris. London: Ward and Co. 1837.—This work is so well known as the essay which gained the prize offered by Dr. Conquest, for the best work on the above-mentioned subject, and the best means for its remedy, that we need say little or nothing on its merits: it will be enough to say, that the author has treated his subject in a most masterly style, and that the work is worthy of notice, principally on account of the powerful reasoning and elegant style of writing which pervade its pages.

Sonnets, by Edward Moxon: second edition. London, 1837. These verses possess considerable poetical merit: some of the author's ideas, however, border upon the extravagant. He is ready with a sonnet on any given subject, even on pensions. Witness Sonnet XXV, "Occasioned by the debate on the motion for a Revision of the Pension List," which thus pathetically opens:—

"The times are full of change; and restless men,
Who live by agitation, would devour
The widow's mite—her all,—the orphan's dower,—
If upright minds do not, by speech and pen,
Their fury check."

And, accordingly, Mr. Moxon brings his grey goose quill into requisition. The book, in its typography and paper, is a *bijou*.

St. Agnes' Fountain, an old English Ballad, and other Poems: by J. W. Kelly. London: Darton, 1837.—A neat little book, made up of a collection of verses of a light nature, and well calculated to inspire children with a taste for reading poetry, which we think is the object of the writer.

Poems, original and translated: by Charles Percy Wyatt, B.A. London: Fraser, 1837.—This is an addition to the numberless works of poetry already published, which could almost be dispensed with, were it not for a few of his sonnets, and his translations from the German. The latter are executed with spirit, and the former glide along with ease and smoothness, and display good taste.

The Oakleigh Shooting Code: by Thomas Oakleigh, Esq., with numerous explanatory and other Notes: edited by the Author of "Nights at Oakleigh Old Manor Hall." Second edition. London: Ridgway and Sons, 1837.—This is a very useful manual for Sportsmen. The fewness of the technical terms used in it renders it intelligible to the

every day reader, and no person who aims at becoming an accomplished sportsman, should be without a copy of it. It also contains several valuable hints on the training of the various kinds of dogs used in this exercise.

Beauties of the Country: by Thomas Miller, Author of "A Day in the Woods." London: Van Voorst, 1837.—We have seldom perused a work on this subject that has afforded us greater pleasure; it evinces throughout much originality of conception: and though written in prose, is replete with the imagery and language which belong to the finest poetry. The author shows himself to be an ardent admirer of nature in all its varieties: every thing that belongs to the world of birds, flowers, flowing streamlets, hills, or vallies, possesses enchantments for him: and his vivid imagination causes him to hear the sound of music in the breath of the zephyrs, as they stir the leaves of the plants. We would recommend the perusal of it to every person, but more especially to the young: it would improve their taste much, and inspire them with a love of every thing beautiful in nature. The illustrations, by Mr. Lambert, are very spirited: the frontispiece is quite a gem.

Doveton; or the Man of many Impulses.—This is a very good novel. The incidents which occur in the course of it are of a stirring character, and well calculated to give it that interest which it is so necessary for a novel to possess. There is, moreover, a great deal of sound sense in the observations put into the mouth of Smith, one of the characters in the novel, and a friend of the hero; which is well contrasted with the spiritual abstractedness and poetising temperament of the latter, who, we cannot but think, is endued with too "many impulses;" or rather, it may be, that these are too easily excited. But we will not quarrel much with this, as we have derived some pleasure from the work, which is well written throughout.

Egypt as it is in 1837: by Thomas Waghorn. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1837.—Mr. Waghorn, whose exertions to establish a steam intercourse with our possessions in the East, by the Red Sea, deserve great praise, advocates in this pamphlet the independence of Egypt; to effect which, he thinks, that the bare *permission* of England is all that is requisite. Now, although we are desirous for the independence of the land of the Pharaohs as much as Mr. Waghorn can be, we demur to any hostile interference on the part of this country to effect it. The Egyptian army, according to Mr. Waghorn, amounts to 100,400 regulars, and 13,450 irregulars: and the effective naval force consists of eight line of battle-ships (four of which mount 110 guns each), five frigates, and sixteen corvettes, brigs, and cutters.

Investigation; or, Travels in the Boudoir: by Caroline A. Halsted. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1837.—Miss, or Mrs. Halsted, appears to be a thorough-going Tory—an admirer of things as they are—in Church and State; and being fully persuaded, "that perhaps there never was a period when the minds of the rising generation required more than at the present to be impressed with the value of those sacred institutions in Church and State, which have contributed to raise their country to the highest pinnacle of glory," she produces "Investigation,"—the chief object of

which "is to prove to young persons of active imaginations, that happiness and knowledge depend, not as such are too frequently disposed to imagine, on a foreign tour; but that much valuable information may be obtained in their own country—amusement in their own homes—nay, pleasant variety and real entertainment, *even in those very apartments*, where for want of occupation, many an intelligent mind may have idly lounged for hours, listlessly wishing for some novelty." This "valuable information," picked up in the boudoir, consists of some knowledge of carpets, tapestry, modern paper hangings, ornamental plumes and feathers, idolatry, oriental china, European porcelain, &c. &c., all, no doubt, very useful for young ladies. But there are matters of graver moment treated of, viz. the History of the Bible, and the Preservation and Purity of the Scriptures. As the lady considers that, "our happiness as individuals, and our greatness as a community, is attributable, chiefly under God's blessing, to the venerable Church establishment," we looked for an attack upon Popery as a matter of course, and we have not been deceived. To notice the many silly observations made by the authoress, in reference to this fertile topic of abuse would be useless, but we cannot pass one or two gross misstatements. In the first place, the writer says, that "the adherents of this (the Roman Catholic) Church are still prohibited, even in England, from reading the Scriptures, in their native tongue!" while in point of fact, no such prohibition ever existed in England. And in the second place, that previous to the Reformation, the Scriptures "remained in Europe in their original languages of Hebrew and Greek, or were translated into Latin only;" while the truth is, that very shortly after the invention of printing, and long before the Reformation, so-called, translations of the Scriptures were printed in the vernacular languages of Germany, Italy, France, Belgium, and Spain. Enough.

Funeral Oration on his Eminence Cardinal Weld. Delivered at his solemn obsequies in the Church of St. Maria, in Aquiro, April 22, 1837. By N. Wiseman, D.D. Rome. 1837. London. Reprinted by Booker and Dolman. This is an eloquent tribute to departed worth, and should find a place in the library of every Catholic. Did our limits permit we would give an extract or two from the pleasing biographical sketch of the eminent person who is the deserving object of the learned Doctor's eulogy; but curtailment would be doing an injustice to the orator, and we must therefore refer our readers to the discourse itself.

A Discourse on the complete Restoration of Man, morally and physically considered. By Daniel Chapman. London. Hamilton, Adams and Co. 1837. We have been able only to glance over this volume; but this slight perusal has satisfied us that it is a work of great merit, well calculated to inspire the reader with a high religious feeling, and to rouse the attention of the unthinking sceptic. Mr. Chapman's speculations upon the physical restoration of man, are curious and interesting.

A History of England from the Invasion of the Romans. By John Lingard, D.D. The fourth edition, correctly and considerably enlarged.

Vol. I. London. Baldwin and Cradock. 1837. This valuable work is already so well known, that a mere allusion to this new edition is all that is necessary. It has now received the last corrections of the learned Author, who has made considerable additions to the text, which have enhanced its importance as the only History of England which can be relied upon for accuracy and impartiality. Dr. Lingard, we believe, does not contemplate a continuation of his history. We think the publishers might have displayed more taste in getting up this work. The typography of Messrs. Clowes is not just what we should have expected from their respectable establishment.

Views of the Architecture of the Heavens, in a Series of Letters to a Lady. By J. P. Nichol, LL.D. F.R.S.E. Professor of Practical Astronomy in the University of Glasgow. Edinburgh. William Tait. 1837. For those who have little time to devote to the study of the sublime science of Astronomy, this work is peculiarly well fitted, being written in a popular style, and free from what may be called the technicalities of the system. In Part I. the Professor treats of the form of the existing universe; in Part II. of the constituent mechanisms or the principle of vitality of stellar arrangements; and in the third, or concluding part, of the origin and probable destiny of the present form of the material creation. This last head comprises a short dissertation upon the nebulae, particularly that of Orion, compared by Sir John Herschel "to a curdling liquid, or a surface strewn over with flocks of wool, or the breaking up of a mackerel sky, when the clouds of which it consists begin to assume a cirrous appearance." The work is illustrated by twenty-two plates, chiefly taken from graphic representations by the two Herschels.

An Essay concerning the Nature of Man. By John Dayman. London. Longman and Co. 1837.—The Author professes himself to be "a firm believer in the authenticity and sacred character of the Scriptures, as received by the Protestant churches;" and as such hesitates down to write a book to prove that the doctrine of a material body and an immaterial and immortal soul is a "heathen notion," and "when applied to the scheme of religion laid down in the Bible is full of inconsistencies!" This is bible-reading with a vengeance. Mr. Dayman's opinions are too absurd for refutation.

The Contention of Death and Love, a Poem. London. Moxon. 1837.—The subject of this poem is a contention between Death and Love, who are fancifully represented as sisters, standing at the bedside of a sick poet. The dispute is, whether the poet shall be numbered with the dead or with the living. They are both eloquent, and there is a good deal of beauty and winning affection in the address of Death to her sister, while those of the latter are much more forcible. After all, Love is content that the poet's memory should outlive his mortal remains, and this furnishes our author with an opportunity of indulging his muse and letting her fly

— "through
"The unfathomed depths of ether blue."

The Progress of Creation considered with reference to the present condition of the Earth. By Mary Roberts. London. Smith, Elder, and Co. 1837.—This interesting subject is handled by our fair authoress with all the ability which we were led to expect from seeing her name on the title-page. The knowledge of natural history which she brings to bear upon the subject shows her to be very well versed in this science, and the entertaining manner in which she communicates that knowledge cannot fail to attract the attention of her readers. The work, to use a bookseller's phrase, is "well got up."

The Irish Tourist, or the People and the Provinces of Ireland. London: Darton and Harvey. 1837.—This is rather a commonplace affair, yet the work is not without interest; and though tinged with an anti-catholic feeling, it contains more liberal sentiments than are usually to be met with in the writings of tourists in Ireland. Our traveller found party spirit still rampant in Londonderry, in the person of an Orange guide, who appeared to wish for an opportunity of bringing the Catholics to open war with the Protestants; and "a gentlemanly townsman," who remarked that he had served his country well, and liked rest and quiet, but that he should not be sorry to see 'a good sound rebellion in Ireland;' that (he continued) is the only thing to put us to a right state—the Catholics must lose thousands and millions before there is peace in Ireland—an open rebellion, and an English army to put the rascals down, would do the business at once!" This "gentlemanly townsman" then "ran into a most furious tirade against the Melbourne ministry. Lord Mulgrave and Lord Morpeth were traitors, infidels—no name was too bad for them; the Education Board was an atheistical device; and Orange-men and Orange-lodges were the only instruments for the regeneration of Ireland!" Such are the real sentiments, not of a few individuals, but of the whole *genus*, from Ernest King of Hanover down to Sam Gray. How fortunate for Ireland that Victoria is now her sovereign, instead of the Grand Master of the Orange Lodges! She has thus been spared another Iliad of woes.

Education Reform. By T. Wyse, M.P. Vol. I. London: Longman and Co. 1837.—The question of national education is of too great importance to admit of much longer delay in bringing it into practical operation. Mr. Wyse, to whose indefatigable labours this cause is under the deepest obligations, advocates no untried theory, but the establishment of a system of universal education, which has been already found to work well in those countries where it has been tried. He treats the subject in the volume before us in the spirit of true philosophy, and his views are those of an enlightened and accomplished statesman, destined, we hope, to act a distinguished part in the regeneration of his country.

Sequel to Sematology, being an attempt to clear the way for the Regeneration of Metaphysics, comprising Strictures on Platonism, Materialism, Scotch Intellectual Philosophy & Phrenology, Brougham's Additions to Paley, Logic at Oxford and in the Edinburgh Review, &c. By the Author of "An Outline of Sematology, or an Essay towards

establishing a new Theory of Grammar, Logic, and Rhetoric. 1837.— Certes Mr. Smart is quite a giant in his own way—a metaphysical Goliath, who derides with scorn the host of modern metaphysicians as a puny race, wholly unacquainted with the science of mind. Yet he does not mean “to fill up the vacancy which a century and a half of inattention” to the science of metaphysics, as Locke proposed it, has left. “My attempt” (he observes) “is only to clear the way; and to this end I shall think that I have not been uselessly employed if I induce people to ponder whether Scotch intellectual philosophy and Oxford reviving logic, the northern-lights in Albemarle-street, and Aristotle at Edinburgh, and Brougham at work on Paley, are not unwholesome *miasmata* in our literary atmosphere, which must be qualified or swept away, before metaphysics can be regenerated and flourish as a useful branch of useful learning.” This is no doubt very modest, but modesty may be carried too far, and although in our author’s opinion it is not for one man nor perhaps for one generation to supply the vacancy now existing in metaphysical science, we would advise him to endeavour to fill it up *quam primum*.

Postscript to ARTICLE IV, page 113.

Since the article on Canada was sent to press, we received six weeks later intelligence from Canada, our advices now reaching the 9th of June.

The determination announced in the letter dated 23rd April, and printed at pages 110-111, has been very generally acted upon. During the interval in question, the whole country has been in a state of extreme agitation. Numerous county meetings have been held, denouncing in the strongest terms the government measure, and pledging themselves to resist by every means in their power.

The proceedings of all these county meetings are nearly of the same tenour.

They declare, that from this time forward, the connexion of Canada with the mother country is one of *force* only. That they will do all in their power to bring about the independence of the Colony.

They pledge themselves, and they earnestly recommend their fellow citizens, to abstain from the use of all those commodities which bear a duty, and so afford a revenue to the government.

They declare the smuggler worthy of the good opinion and gratitude of his fellow citizens, and they denounce as base, infamous, and deserving of the execration of the country, all who inform against the smuggler.

At one meeting, that of the County of Two-Mountains, a smuggled tea-chest, a home-made whiskey barrel, and some smuggled tobacco, were carried in the procession, with appropriate banners, and not a revenue officer dared to interfere.

Numerous county meetings are still announced.

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1837.

ART. I.—*Novalis Schriften. Herausgegeben von L. Tieck und F. Schlegel.* Berlin. 1826.—*The Writings of Novalis. Edited by L. Tieck and F. Schlegel.* Berlin. 1826. 4th Edit.

NOVALIS belonged to that brilliant society, consisting, besides himself, of Tieck and the two Schlegels, which, at the commencement of the present century, produced a mighty revolution in German literature; and has exerted an influence not more extensive than beneficial on the German mind. If “new and purer views of art”* have been established—if the progress of that literary Paganism which Lessing, and Herder, and Voss, and Göthe, had encouraged and promoted, hath been happily arrested—if while the fullest justice hath been rendered to the claims of antique genius, the long-neglected art and literature of the Middle Age have regained their hold on our sympathies and admiration—if, as in the case of Novalis and F. Schlegel, the foundations have been laid for a Christian school in history and metaphysics—it is by the illustrious men we speak of, that these benefits have been achieved. And if to these we add the name of Stolberg, for the department of theology and ecclesiastical history, we have then named the five Promethean spirits that in our age brought down new fire from heaven, and recast, as it were, the mould of the German mind.

In this article it is our intention to review the interesting biography of Novalis, which Tieck has prefixed to the fourth edition of his friend's writings; next among those writings we shall particularly call the reader's attention to a beautiful historical fragment, entitled “Christendom,” as well as to many of his detached thoughts on religion, literature, and politics; and we shall conclude with a short parallel between him and his most distinguished literary friend and associate.

Frederick von Hardenberg, called Novalis, was born on the 2nd of May, 1772, on a family estate in the Countship of

* Wiseman's “Connexion of Science and Revealed Religion.”

Mansfeld. His father, the Baron von Hardenberg, was director of the salt-mines of Saxony. He was a member of the community of *Hernhutters*; and was distinguished as much for his frankness and liveliness of character, as for his virtue and piety. His wife belonged to the same religious community, and was a pattern of domestic virtue. The occupations of her husband often occasioning his absence from home, the care of directing her children's education devolved upon her; and this trust she executed with a zeal and an intelligence, crowned by Providence with the best success. Novalis was the second of eleven children. In his first years he was very weakly, very quiet and retiring in his manners, giving no indication of particular talent, and remarked only by his peculiar fondness for his mother. On recovering from a dangerous illness, which he experienced in his ninth year, he became more lively and active, and evinced greater aptitude for learning. At twelve years of age, he already possessed a pretty tolerable knowledge of Latin, and some acquaintance with Greek; and his biographer informs us, that at that early period he composed some pieces of poetry, which are to be found among his papers.

From this time his application was unremitting; and history, especially, he read with uncommon avidity. In the year 1790, he went to study at the University of Jena; and in 1792 visited, with his brother Erasmus, the University of Leipzig. There he remained till the following year, when he repaired to the University of Wittenberg, and there completed his studies.

"At this time," says his distinguished friend and biographer Tieck, "he made the acquaintance of Frederick Schlegel, whose warmest friend he soon became; he also came to know Fichte, and these two spirits exerted a great and permanent influence on his whole life. The philosophical system of Fichte he studied after some time with unwearied zeal. When he had quitted Wittenberg, he went to Arnstadt in Thuringia, in order to initiate himself in affairs of public business under the director of the Circle, Just. This excellent man soon became one of his most confidential friends. It was not long after his arrival in Arnstadt, that on a neighbouring estate he was introduced to Sophia von K—. The first view of this fair and surprisingly lovely creature decided his destiny; nay, we might almost say, that the deep lasting impression she made on his soul, formed the tenour of his whole existence. Even in the forms of infancy, there is at times an expression, which, as it is too sweet, too spiritually lovely, we call unearthly or heavenly; and these luminous and almost transparent faces usually excite an apprehension, that they are too tender, too delicately framed for this life, and that it is death or immortality which from those brilliant eyes gazes on us so significantly. And too often doth a rapid decay realize our fearful anticipations. Still more

captivating are those forms when they have happily passed infancy, and when they bloom in the first years of maidenhood. All those who have known the charming creature, the object of our friend's affection, concur in stating, that the grace and heavenly sweetness which encompassed this unearthly being, the beauty which shone about her, and the interest and majesty wherewith she was invested, exceeded all power of description. Novalis became a poet as often as he spoke of her. She had concluded her thirteenth year when he first became acquainted with her; the spring and summer of 1795 was the most blooming period of his life; every hour which he could snatch from business he passed in Grüningen, and in the autumn of that year he received from Sophia's parents the promise which was to decide his future destiny. Shortly after, Sophia fell dangerously ill of a fever, accompanied with stitches in the side; and although after some weeks she recovered, still the pains in the side continued, and by their extreme acuteness marred many a fair hour. Novalis was deeply affected by the illness of a creature he so much idolized; yet the assurance of her physician that these pains were not of a serious nature, tended to remove his uneasiness."—*Life*, p. 11-12.

Soon after her recovery, Novalis repaired to Weisenfels, and was appointed auditor in the department in which his father was director. The winter of 1795 found Novalis engaged in his new official pursuits, and enjoying the beloved society of his parents, and brothers, and sisters. The letters which he received from Grüningen gave him the most satisfactory accounts of Sophia's health; and he now confidently looked forward to a speedy union with the object of his most ardent affections. Alas! too soon were these pleasing hopes destined to be blighted. In the summer of 1796, Novalis received the distressing intelligence that Sophia had been obliged to repair to Jena to undergo a dangerous operation for an abscess on the lungs. He hastened thither to meet her. Her medical attendant gave him reason to think that her recovery would be slow. It was found necessary to repeat the operation; and this, the physician feared her feeble frame would be incapable of enduring. She languished for many months in a state of great debility, enduring all her sufferings with a heavenly fortitude and resignation. At last, on the 17th of March, 1797, this interesting creature expired in the arms of her sister, and of her faithful and affectionate governess, a Madlle. Danscours.

• These melancholy tidings his brother Charles ventured, after some difficulty, to convey to Novalis.

"The latter," says his biographer, "secluded himself, and after three days and nights of weeping, repaired to his faithful friends at Arnstadt, in order to be near the spot which contained the remains of all he most valued on earth."

Among his writings we have found a beautiful letter, which he addressed to a friend on the death of Sophia. We shall take the liberty to translate one of the most interesting passages :—

“It is my melancholy duty to convey to you the intelligence that Sophia is no more. After indescribable sufferings, which she endured with the most exemplary fortitude, she expired on the 17th of March, at half-past ten o'clock in the morning. She was born on the 17th of March, 1783, and on the 15th of March, 1795, I received from her the assurance that she would be mine. Since the 17th of November, 1795, she has been suffering. Eight days before her death I left her, with the strongest conviction that I should never again see her. It was beyond my power to remain an impotent spectator of the painful struggles under which youth in its first bloom succumbed—to witness the fearful anguish of this celestial creature. This fate I had never apprehended. It was but three weeks ago that I first perceived its threatening. Evening has closed around me, while I was yet looking for the dawn. My grief is as boundless as my love. For three years she was my hourly thought. She alone attached me to life, to my country, to my occupations. With her I am severed from all things, for I have almost lost my very self.”—*Works*, p. 209.

This heart, so true, so devoted in love, was, as our readers may suppose, open to all the kindly feelings of fraternal affection.

His brother Erasmus, who had been long ailing, Novalis had the misfortune to lose on the 14th of April, 1797, about a month after Sophia's death. In a letter, which he addressed on this melancholy occasion to his brother Charles, who was absent on a journey, he writes as follows : “Be comforted, Erasmus hath triumphed; the flowers of the lovely wreath have detached themselves here, only to grow into a fairer and immortal crown above.”

“At this period,” says his biographer, “Novalis lived only for his grief: it had become natural to him to consider the visible and invisible world but as one, and to separate life and death only by his desire after the latter. For him existence assumed a glorified aspect, and his whole life flowed along as in a clear conscious dream of a higher state of being. The sanctity of grief, deep inward love, and pious aspirations after death, pervaded his whole being and all its creations: nay, it is very possible that it was this period of profound sorrow which sowed in his constitution the germs of death, were it not already his predestined fate so early to be snatched away from us.”—*Life*, p. 14.

After having passed some weeks in Thuringia, he returned consoled to his occupations, which he prosecuted with more than ordinary zeal. At this time he composed many of those literary and philosophical fragments, of which we propose giving some interesting specimens, before we conclude this article. In the

year which followed, he formed the acquaintance of his biographer, Tieck—an acquaintance which soon ripened into the most lasting friendship. Tieck speaks of the many happy hours which he passed in his society, as well as in that of Schelling, Ritter, and the two Schlegels, who then formed a brilliant assemblage of talent at Jena.

About this time he became acquainted with Julia von Ch——; and his biographer makes a sort of apology, that he should have been affianced to her a year after the demise of Sophia.

“Sophia,” says he, as we see from Novalis’s works, “still remained the centre of his thoughts—in death she received from him a worship almost more devoted than when she was yet visible; but he thought beauty and amiability might in some degree compensate the severe loss he had sustained.”—*Life*, p. 15.

This defence is not sophistical. These generous natures yearn for sympathy; and reciprocity of affection is, as it were, a necessity of their being. Hence, when death has deprived them of the objects of their first deep enthusiastic love, it is in new affections they seek the solace of a grief, otherwise too poignant for human endurance; and they search in other beings for a reflection, however faint, of the charms which first captivated their feelings. It is thus, when the glorious sun hath gone down, we love to watch the glowing clouds, that give back, however feebly, the varied splendour of his setting beams.

It was at this period, Novalis composed his beautiful romance of “*Ofterdingen*,” wherein, as in a clear mirror, are reflected all the feelings, the aspirations, the projects, and the occupations of his own life. It was intended, as he himself says, to be “an apotheosis of poetry.” On this romance, as well as on the poetry of Novalis, we regret that our limits will not permit us to enlarge at present; but perhaps we may find another occasion to bring his poetical productions before our readers. Our main business at present is with his historical and philosophical writings, or rather fragments, which the hand of death prevented him from finishing.

His religious poetry, especially his hymns to the Blessed Virgin, are full of grace, tenderness, and piety. There are also many beautiful poetical pieces scattered through the romance we have just spoken of. Among these, we may notice in particular the Song of the Miner, in celebration of the toils and pleasures of his craft.

On a visit which Tieck in the summer of 1800 paid to his friend, he found him observing a vegetable diet, in order to guard against the danger of decline. His spirits were good, but his increasing paleness and emaciation inspired his relatives with

much anxiety. From this period his health rapidly declined. He was compelled to put off his marriage, which was to have taken place in the autumn of the above-mentioned year. The sudden death of a younger brother, which occurred at this time from drowning, so much affected him, that a violent hæmorrhage ensued: whereupon his physician declared his malady to be incurable. In proportion as his debility increased, so his desire to enjoy the milder climate of a southern country became more ardent; but this wish his medical attendant was compelled to oppose, as his strength was inadequate to the fatigues of the journey. In January, 1801, his desire to rejoin his parents becoming more intense, he could not refrain from repairing to Weissenfels.

"The nearer he approached his end," says his biographer, "the more confidently he looked forward to a speedy recovery; for his cough was less troublesome, and, with the exception of languor, he had no feeling of disease. With the hope and desire of life new talents seemed to awake within him; he revolved with new affection all his literary projects; he proposed to write anew his romance of 'Ofterdingen;' and shortly prior to his death, exclaimed on one occasion, 'Now only have I learned what poetry is; countless lays and poems quite different from any thing I have yet written, occur to my mind.' From the 17th of March, the anniversary of the death of his Sophia, he became visibly weaker: many of his friends visited him; and it was a source of great joy to him, when, on the 21st of March, his faithful and earliest friend, Frederick Schlegel, came from Jena to see him. With the latter he conversed much, especially on the subject of their mutual labours. In those days he was very lively, and his nights were calm: he also enjoyed a tolerably sound sleep. On the 25th, about six o'clock in the morning, he begged his brother to hand him some books for the purpose of consulting some passages; he then ordered his breakfast, and spoke with cheerfulness until eight. About nine he requested his brother to play some tune for him on the piano, whereupon he fell asleep. Frederick Schlegel entered soon after into the room, and found him in a calm sleep: this sleep lasted till twelve o'clock, when, without the slightest convulsion, he departed this world, and, unchanged in death, preserved that wonted cheerful mien which had ever characterized him in life.

"Thus died, before he had completed his twenty-ninth year, our excellent friend, in whom all must esteem and admire as well his extensive knowledge and philosophical genius, as his poetical talents. As he was so much beyond his age, his country might have expected from him extraordinary things, had he not been carried off by a premature death: still, the unfinished writings he has left behind have already exerted much influence; and in future times his mighty conceptions will stir up enthusiasm in many a breast, and generous spirits and deep thinkers will feel themselves enlightened and enkindled by the sparks of his genius."—*Life*, p. 19-20.

Of the person of Novalis, his biographer gives the following interesting account :

“ Novalis was tall, slim, and finely proportioned. He wore his light-brown hair in descending curls, which then was less singular than it would be now : his hazel eye was clear and brilliant, and the complexion of his face, especially his intellectual brow, was almost transparent The outline and expression of his face nearly resembled that of St. John the Evangelist, as represented in the fine large painting by Albert Dürer, which is preserved at Munich.”—*Life*, p. 20-21.

Tieck then gives the following just estimate of his friend's genius. It will be seen that Novalis's pursuits in one respect differed materially from those of his literary associates. The fine arts, to which *they* devoted so much of their attention, *he* comparatively neglected ; while, on the other hand, the physical sciences were an especial object of his predilection. But in these he sought rather the beautiful, the significant, and the mysterious, than the useful. Nature to him was a divine epos, containing every species of poetry, the sublime and the elegant, the sober and the fantastic, the tragic and the gay.

“ His regular studies had been for many years philosophy and physics. In the latter, his perceptions, anticipations, and combinations, often went beyond his time. In philosophy he had particularly studied Spinoza and Fichte ; but he afterwards struck out for himself an original path, by labouring to unite philosophy with religion ; and so the fragments which exist of the New Platonists, as well as the writings of the Mystics, were in this respect of great importance to him. His knowledge in mathematics, as well as in the mechanical arts, especially mining, was considerable. On the other hand, in the real or higher arts, he had taken but slight interest. Of music he was very fond, although he possessed but a superficial acquaintance with it. To sculpture and painting his attention had been but little drawn, although upon all these arts he could express the most original ideas, and the loftiest perceptions. Thus I remember a discussion we had upon landscape-painting, in which I could not coincide with his views ; yet these views I afterwards found in a great measure realized by the excellent landscape-painter, Frederick of Dresden, out of the rich stores of his poetical genius. In poetry he was quite as much a stranger—he had read but few poets, and had paid little attention to criticism, and the ordinary systems of poetical art.

“ Thus, uncontaminated by examples, he discovered a new path of poetical representation ; and in the variety of his views, in his conception of love, and faith in love, which was at once his teacher, his philosophy, and religion—in the fact that his whole poetry and all its meditations are coloured by one great event of his life, by a deep sorrow for a mighty loss, he alone resembles, among all moderns, the

sublime Dante; and like him he sings an unfathomably mystic song, very unlike that of many imitators, who think mysticism an ornament, which they can put on and take off at pleasure."—*Life*, p. 22-23.

But it is now time to introduce our readers to the writings of Novalis. Among these, one of the most important, and to Catholic readers perhaps the most interesting, is the small historical fragment adverted to above, entitled *Christendom*, and which was composed in the year 1799. This may truly be termed a literary bijou; and small as it is, yet so excellent in form and matter, it would alone have established the author's reputation. When we consider the amiable feelings with which it abounds, the tone of religious earnestness that pervades it, the originality and loftiness of many of its views, and the signal fulfilment which several of its predictions have received in our times, we are tempted to weep over the untimely fate which bereaved the world of this excellent and highly gifted young man. It is interesting, also, to trace in this little work the struggle between early prejudices on the one hand, and the spontaneous suggestions of awakening independent reason on the other—between the writer's hereditary Protestant notions on the one side, and his self-formed Catholic opinions on the other.

We shall first give a rapid outline of its contents, and then extract the most interesting passages.

The author commences with the early ages of Christendom, and celebrates the beauty and holiness of worship in the Catholic Church, as well as of many of its religious rites and practices; the admirable constitution of her hierarchy, together with the zeal, the virtues, and the talents that adorned it; and, lastly, the services which the clergy of those times rendered to the cause of human happiness and civilization. He then shows how a false security had introduced into the clerical order mental inertness and moral laxity; and how the clergy gradually lost the respect and confidence of the laity, till the abuses in the Church at last provoked that great reaction called the Reformation. In his opinion, the evils which that event produced far outbalanced the blessings of which he thinks it was the parent. The essential errors inherent in Protestantism, considered as a religious system—its utter inability to accomplish a moral and political regeneration of Christendom,—are described with brief, but vigorous strokes. Then follows a masterly sketch of the infidelity of the eighteenth century, which is shown to be only a natural filiation of Protestantism. The dawn of a more propitious era for religion and humanity, which in the year 1799 was still so faint and uncertain, did not however escape the penetrating eye

of Novalis. The better direction which literature and philosophy, particularly in Germany, were just then beginning to take, filled him with the most cheering hopes. He concludes his interesting little treatise with the confident persuasion, that the period was not distant, when all Christians would embrace in the bosom of Catholic unity; when, under the divine influence of that Church, art and science, government and morality, would receive a magnificent regeneration; and the reconciliation and restoration of Europe prepare the way for the conversion to Christianity of the other portions of the globe.

Such is the tenour of this admirable little work, so extraordinary when we consider the youth of the author, and so far beyond the historical views and speculations of the time in which it was written. The historical literature of Germany had not then assumed that Catholic tone and spirit, which even in the hands of Protestant writers now frequently distinguishes it. The illustrious friend and associate of Novalis had not then directed his attention to the study of modern history. John von Müller alone, by his honest and generous feelings, his powerful understanding, and his great researches, had been enabled to catch the true spirit of the middle age. A little treatise, entitled *Travels of the Popes*, which this distinguished Protestant wrote in the year 1787, on occasion of the journey of Pius VI. to Vienna; and the object of which is to describe the most important political events connected with Papal journeys, contains, in its observations on the Catholic Hierarchy, and on the moral and political blessings which they conferred on mankind, many striking points of resemblance to the little writing under consideration.

The passages which we shall now proceed to cite, will convince the reader how far the praise bestowed on this treatise is founded in truth.

The author begins with describing the glory and happiness of those ages justly called the heroic ages of Christendom.

"Those were brilliant and glorious times, when Europe formed one Christian country, when one Christendom inhabited this civilized portion of the globe; and one common interest bound together the most remote provinces of this widely-extended spiritual empire. Without great secular possessions, one head guided and united the great political powers. A numerous corporation, to which every one had access, stood in subordination to this head, and executed his mandates, and zealously strove to consolidate his salutary power. Every member of this order was universally respected.

* * * * *

A filial confidence attached men to their instructions. How serenely could each one perform his daily task, when by these holy men a secure futurity was prepared for him, and every transgression was forgiven,

and every dark passage of life was blotted out and effaced. They were the experienced pilots on the great unknown sea, under whose guidance we might safely disregard all storms, and confidently expect a secure landing on the coast of our true country.

"The most savage, impetuous passions were compelled to bend with awe and submission to their words. Peace went out from them. They preached nothing but love for the holy marvellous Virgin of Christianity, who, endowed with a heavenly power, was prepared to rescue every believer from the most fearful dangers. They spake of long departed men of God, who, by their attachment and fidelity to that blessed mother and her divine child, had withstood the temptations of the world, had attained unto heavenly honours, and were now become tutelary and beneficent powers to their brethren on earth, willing helpers in their wants, intercessors for human frailty, and efficacious friends to humanity at the throne of God. With what serenity of mind did men leave the beautiful assemblies in those mysterious churches, which were adorned with heart-stirring pictures, filled with the sweetest odours, and enlivened by a holy and exalting music! In them were gratefully preserved, in costly vessels, the sacred relics of these venerable servants of God. And in these churches, too, glorious signs and miracles attested as well the efficacious beneficence of these happy saints, as the Divine goodness and omnipotence. In the same way as tender souls preserve locks of hair, or autographs of their departed loves, and nourish thereby the sweet flame of affection, down to the reuniting hour of death; so men then gathered with pious assiduity whatever had belonged to these holy souls, and every one esteemed himself happy, who could possess, or even touch, such consoling relics. Here and there the grace of heaven lighted down on some favoured image, or tombstone. Thither men flocked from all countries to proffer their fair donations, and brought back in return those celestial gifts—peace of mind, and health of body.

"This powerful but pacific society zealously sought to make all men participators in its beautiful faith, and sent forth its missionaries to announce everywhere the gospel of life, and make the kingdom of heaven the only kingdom in this world.

* * * * *

At the Court of the Head of the Church, the most prudent and most venerable men in Europe were assembled. Thither all treasures flowed: the destroyed Jerusalem had avenged herself, and Rome had become Jerusalem—the holy abode of God's government on the earth. Princes submitted their disputes to the arbitration of the common Father of Christendom, willingly laid down at his feet their crowns and their regal pomp, and esteemed it a glory to become members of the great clerical fraternity, and pass the evening of their lives in divine contemplation within the walls of a cloister. How very beneficial, how well adapted to the exigencies of human nature were these religious institutions, is proved by the vigorous expansion of all human energies—by the harmonious development of all moral and intellectual faculties, which they promoted—by the prodigious height which indi-

viduals attained to in every department of art and science—and by the universally prosperous condition of trade, whether in intellectual or material merchandize, throughout the whole extent of Europe, and even to the remotest India.”—*Works*, pp. 190-191.

We hold it to be the duty of a critic, not merely to exhibit with impartiality the opinions of the author whose work he reviews, but also, in important cases, where his opinions coincide with those of the writer, to support and defend them to the utmost of his ability. This is one of the most effectual means of imparting interest and utility to periodical literature, and of raising criticism above the routine of mere analysis. Accordingly we shall here venture to corroborate the opinions of our author on the Catholic hierarchy, by the testimony of two illustrious witnesses, one of whom, like Novalis, continued a Protestant, and the other, born a Protestant, had the happiness to be received into the bosom of that Church, for which, like Novalis, he had long entertained the most fervent love and admiration. The great Protestant historian, John von Müller, in the work already adverted to, *Travels of the Popes*, thus speaks of the services rendered by the Papacy to the cause of liberty and civilization.

“From the emancipated Guelphic cities of Italy, the arts and sciences poured their treasures into the hitherto barbarous life of the old Europeans. In them the charms of elegance were first felt—in them society assumed a more agreeable form. In republican institutions, in comprehensive measures of foreign policy, they took the lead: by means of navigation and industry, and without bloodshed, they united all parts of the world. To them manufactures owe their origin—in the system of exchanges they were the teachers—the imperial cities were formed on their model. It was to Pope Alexander III these cities were indebted for all their blessings. A superior they doubtless needed—but a military superior would have been formidable in victory, and ruinous in adversity.”* Again, he thus writes: “Gregory, Alexander, Innocent, raised a dike against a torrent which threatened to sweep over the earth. Here their paternal hands founded (*bauten*)† the hierarchy, and by the side of it established the freedom of states. Without the freedom of states, Rome might fall by the rescript of a despot—without the hierarchy, it was impossible to infuse into all nations uniformity of religious principles. Without the Pope, the Church had been

* “Reisen der Päpste,” p. 34-35.

† Here John von Müller speaks like a Protestant. It was Jesus Christ only who founded the hierarchy; but, under the grace of God, the above-named Popes consolidated it against the attacks of the secular power.

like an army, whose general was slain: Mayence, Treves, Cologne, the whole episcopal bench, the cathedral chapters, would have felt it to their cost. Without the hierarchy, Europe would have had no society; for the hierarchy (were it but for its own advantage) was compelled to watch incessantly over the general weal."*

Let us hear now the illustrious friend of Novalis, in that beautiful work, the first-fruits of his conversion, which he laid on the altar of the Church.

Speaking of the same period which Müller has just been characterizing, the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, Frederick Schlegel, in his *Modern History*, observes: "Of ignorance and a deficiency of mental cultivation, an age cannot with justice be accused, in which not only the Mediterranean sea (as in the most flourishing period of the Greeks), but even the remote Baltic, an object of terror to the ignorance of antiquity, were both covered with richly laden vessels, while their shores were studded with prosperous and powerful commercial cities—an age in which architecture took a new spring, and painting attained an unexampled height of perfection—wherein philosophy, almost too generally diffused, became a concern of life and of policy—wherein all the historical and literary knowledge within the grasp of the age was seized on with the most passionate avidity; and the physical and mathematical sciences were prosecuted and investigated with indefatigable labour, till those two great discoveries by which the human mind first attained its majority—the discovery of the New World and of the solar system—of heaven and earth in their true magnitude, at last crowned the inquisitive industry of ages."†

But to return to our author. He proceeds to state some of the causes which in his opinion prepared the way for the Reformation. These he finds in the abuse of learning—the degeneracy of philosophy—the intellectual superiority, which, owing to the supineness and tepidity of many of the clerical order, the laity had latterly acquired. Here he notices that law of fluctuation which governs human history, and which the illustrious Görres has since developed with such admirable talent. "Is there not," he asks, "a certain oscillation inherent in historic periods, and are they not subject to an alternation of opposite movements?" To this question he replies, "Yes, progressive, ever extending evolutions, these form the true matter of history."

* "Reisen der Päpste," p. 44.

† "Friedrich Schlegel über die neuere Geschichte," p. 220, 222. Wien, 1811.

Our readers must bear in mind, that however favourable the judgment which Novalis pronounces on the Catholic Church, he still contemplates it from the Protestant point of view. Accordingly they will not be surprised at the following passage, where, speaking of the Reformers, he says :

“They established a multitude of correct maxims, they introduced a multitude of laudable things, and abolished a multitude of corrupt opinions ; but they forgot the necessary result of their process ; they separated the inseparable, they divided the indivisible Church, and criminally severed themselves from the universal Christian society, by which and in which alone, a pure, permanent regeneration was possible.”

Here we see the amiable Novalis still under the influence of early prejudices, confounding accidental abuses in the Catholic Church with its approved practices—a wild or extreme opinion of an individual doctor with the declared and recognized dogmas of our religion. Like every other great heresy, the Reformation doubtless provoked a salutary reaction in the minds of the faithful ; called the attention of the rulers of the Church to existing abuses, and awoke a general spirit of zeal, watchfulness, and activity ; and in this sense, and by this means, the Reformers may be said to have occasioned “a number of laudable things.”

The destruction of religious unity, with which our author charges the Reformers, was not in his opinion remedied by the establishment of Consistories. These the secular princes took under their protection ; and glad enough were they to make the Protestant clergy feel the weight of their power. The interference of these sovereigns in ecclesiastical concerns ; the obstacles which they opposed to any general union of the Protestant Churches ; and the consequent confinement of religion within territorial limits, were, as our author observes, calculated to divest religion of its *cosmopolite* interest, and to annihilate that wholesome, tutelary, and *unifying* influence, which Christianity had once exerted over the nations of Europe.

The inherent defects of Protestantism are laid open with great skill, as well as boldness, in the following passage :

“This pure notion of religion was far from forming the basis of Protestantism ; but Luther in general treated Christianity in a most arbitrary manner, misapprehended its spirit, and introduced another religion,—namely, the holy *all-availableness of the Bible*,* and thereby, alas ! another extremely exotic and earthly science was mingled up in the concern of religion,—philology, whose destructive influence has

* “Die heilige Allgemeingültigkeit der Bibel.”

been ever since but too apparent.* From a vague feeling of this error, Luther was by a great portion of Protestants raised to the rank of an Evangelist, and his translation of the Bible made canonical scripture.

"To the religious sense this philological spirit was extremely hurtful, for nothing so destroys its excitability as the dead letter. Prior to the Reformation, the broad outline, and rich, abundant materials of Catholic theology, as well as the esoteric preservation of the scriptures, and the holy authority of Councils and of Popes, prevented the dead letter from working so injuriously."—p. 195.

After lamenting the destruction of these antidotes, the author proceeds :

"Hence the history of Protestantism no longer exhibits any great splendid phenomena of super-mundane feeling or action—its commencement alone beams with a transient fire from heaven : soon afterwards, a dryness of the religious sense becomes perceptible. Worldly interests have obtained the ascendant ; the feeling for art sympathetically suffers ; now and then a pure, eternal vital spark shoots forth, and a small community will coalesce. The spark becomes extinct, and immediately the community splits asunder, and swims down with the common stream. So it was with Zinzendorf, Jacob Böhme, and several others. The Moderatists have gained the ascendancy, and the period of a complete atony of the higher organs—of a general practical unbelief, is fast approaching. At the Reformation, Christendom was completely undone. Henceforth it cannot be said to exist. Catholics and Protestants, in their sectarian opposition, stood farther aloof from each other, than from Mahometans and Pagans.

"The states that still remained Catholic, continued to vegetate, not without imperceptibly feeling the injurious influence of the neighbouring Protestant countries. It was in the course of this period that the system of *modern politics* arose ; and some powerful states sought to seize, and convert into a throne, the vacant chair of universal umpirage."—p. 195-196.

After reprobating the encroachments, which, during this period, some Catholic princes ventured to make on the jurisdiction of the Church—their haughty disregard to the religious feelings of their subjects, and their audacious attempts to throw off the yoke of Papal authority, our author gives the following spirited sketch of the Society of Jesus. In the eulogium which

* In a work which the celebrated Protestant philosopher Schelling published, about twenty years ago, there is a passage containing a striking coincidence of view with the opinion expressed by Novalis. "So we shall be compelled to seek in philology, as it is called, for the palladium of orthodoxy. And thus in the room of a living authority, the authority of dead books written in dead languages will be established ; and as this from its very nature cannot be binding, a much more ignoble servitude will be the result."—*Vorlesungen über das akademische studium*, p. 200. (Lectures on academic studies, by Professor von Schelling.)

he pronounces on this illustrious order, there is one defect common to many Protestant admirers of the Jesuits—a too exclusive admiration, whereby that body of men are lauded at the expense of other members of the clerical order, and even of the very Church itself. The great society of Ignatius was indeed a powerful instrument in the hands of Divine Providence; yet it was but one among many means instituted by His merciful wisdom, in the sixteenth century, for checking the progress of heresy, spreading the light of faith in distant regions, improving public education, and reforming literature and science.

“Happily for the ancient Church, a new order arose, upon which the dying spirit of the hierarchy seemed to have poured out its last gifts, which infused a new energy into the old body, and with wonderful penetration and constancy, with a wisdom yet unexampled, undertook the defence of the Papacy, and sought its more vigorous regeneration. Never in the history of the world had such a society yet arisen. The Roman senate itself had not formed its plans for the conquest of the world with greater certainty of success. Never had a lofty idea been carried out into execution with more consummate intelligence. * * * A more dangerous rival the new Lutheranism could not have found. All the charms of the Catholic faith received fresh potency under its hands; into its cells all the treasures of science flowed back. What the Church had lost in Europe, this society sought to regain in other portions of the globe—in the most remote regions of the East and West: and the apostolic dignity and vocation it made peculiarly its own. In endeavours after popularity, its members were not behind-hand; and they well knew how much Luther had been indebted for success to his democratic arts, and to his attention to the common people. Everywhere they established schools, they sat in confessionals, they mounted the pulpit, and kept the press in activity; they became poets and philosophers, ministers and martyrs, and at the prodigious distance of America from Europe, and of Europe from China, kept up in respect to facts and doctrines, a most wonderful communication. Out of their schools they recruited their order with wise selection. * *

“To them alone are the Catholic states, and especially the Papal See, indebted for their having so long survived the Reformation: and who knows how old the world would still have looked, had the weakness of ecclesiastical superiors, the jealousy of princes, the jealousy of other religious orders, court intrigues, and other strange circumstances, not combined to check the bold career of this society, and with it to annihilate the last bulwark of the Catholic Church. That once formidable order now slumbers in obscurity and poverty on the confines of Europe, from whence perhaps it is destined, like the people* which affords it protection, with renovated power, and perhaps

* Novalis here alludes to the Russians, whose government afforded an asylum to the Jesuits, when they were expelled from all other European states.

under another name, to spread one day over its ancient seats."—p. 196-198.

Here, we trust, our readers will agree with us, that the Jesuits have found a noble avenger for the insults, invectives, and calumnies, which, like the Divine Master whose name they bear, they have often to sustain from the children of the world. Honour, eternal honour to a society which has rendered such signal services to the cause of religion, humanity, and science; which is gratefully cherished and protected by the Catholic Church, and esteemed and honoured by the men most distinguished for learning and virtue in the Protestant world! But let not our admiration of one set of men blind us to the merits of another. The Jesuits, as we said before, were not the only combatants of heresy—the only resuscitators of piety, and reformers of abuses in learning or education, whom the sixteenth century produced. In that great and godly work of moral and intellectual regeneration, which was begun about the middle of the sixteenth century, and carried far down into the following age, many and various labourers co-operated.

Among these, we may name two religious institutes, whose foundation preceded that of the Jesuits, and whose members, by their example, as well as instruction, powerfully contributed towards the revival of piety, and the correction of abuses among all orders of men in Italy. These were the Theatines, established in 1524, by Gaetano da Thiene and Caraffa; and the Barnabites, founded somewhat later by Zaccaria, Ferrari, and Morigia. Both orders bore the name of *regular clerks*, and devoted themselves especially to preaching, administration of the sacraments, and visitation of the sick. Next, we may notice the order of the Samaschi, founded by Jerome Omelian, in the year 1532, and destined especially for the care and education of orphan children, and for obtaining asylums for female penitents. Two congregations, designed for imparting religious instruction to all classes, the one entitled "Fathers of Christian Doctrine," founded by Cæsar da Buss, in the year 1597, and the other established about the year 1562, by a Milanese nobleman, named Sadis Cusani, are entitled to a place in this enumeration.

In Lucca, a similar congregation was instituted in 1570, by a certain John Leonardi, after he had received the subdeaconship.

In the year 1548, the congregation of the priests of the Oratory, dedicated to the Holy Trinity, was founded by the celebrated St. Philip Neri. Its object was to promote devotional exercises among the clergy, and to advance theological science. To this learned and pious society, we are indebted for a Baronius,

a Raynaldi, and an Antony Gallonius. On the model of this society, Father Matthias Guerra established at Sienna, in 1567, a clerical congregation, called "The Society of the Sacred Nail." Preaching, administration of the holy sacraments, and catechising of children, formed the objects of this institute. A society of the same kind, called the Congregation of St. Joseph, and whose members bound themselves to administer the holy sacraments without receiving any pecuniary compensation, was founded at Rome in 1620, by Father Paul Motha. *The Piarists, or Fathers of Pious Schools*, were instituted at Rome in the seventeenth century, by a Spaniard, Joseph Calasanze, for training youth up in piety and science. It has spread its ramifications through Italy, Poland, Germany, and other countries.

Lastly, St. Charles Borromeo founded at Milan, in 1578, the Congregation of the Oblati, composed of secular ecclesiastics, and destined to minister at all times to the spiritual wants of his archiepiscopal see.

In imitation of the Community of the Oratory, founded by St. Philip Neri, Pierre de Berulle established in France, in the year 1611, the Congregation of the Oratorians, whose object, like that of many religious institutes we have mentioned, was the formation of a learned and exemplary clergy. From its bosom many celebrated writers have sprung. Among these, we may name the philosopher Malebranche; the orientalist, Morinus; the canonist, Thomassin; and the biblical critic, Richard Simon.

St. Vincent of Paul founded, in the year 1624, the Congregation of Missionary Priests, destined to aid the clergy in the discharge of their sacred functions, and to reanimate from time to time, by extraordinary missions, the piety of the people. In 1591, Camillo de Lellis founded the touching institute, entitled "The Fathers of a Good Death," whose duty it was to aid the infirm poor, and to administer consolation to the dying.

In the year 1618, Dom Didier de la Cour established a reformed Congregation of Benedictine monks, under the name of "Maurist Monks." This congregation possessed many abbeys and priories in France. The most learned Benedictines, such as Dom Montfaucon, Dom Mabillon, Dom Ruinart, Dom D'Achery, Dom le Nourri, Dom Martene, Dom Martianary, have adorned its cloisters.

In the year 1525, Matthæus Bassi, afflicted at the relaxation of zeal and piety in the Order of St. Francis, and at the loss of that respect and influence which it once possessed, resolved to introduce a rigid observance of the rules of the founder. Accordingly, he obtained from Pope Clement V the sanction of his

new reforms, and, under the name of Capuchins, instituted an order of men, who, widely diffused over the whole Church, may well be called the "*Forlorn Hope* of Christianity," for in the discharge of the most laborious, the most irksome, and the most perilous services, their heroic devotedness to the Church and to humanity has been ever conspicuous.*

In this enumeration of religious orders, we have confined ourselves to those only which sprang up in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and we have excluded all mention of the female institutes, which, however, exerted a most important influence on religion. Nor have we noticed the mighty regeneration in public morals, effected during those ages by the individual efforts of some holy personages. The influence of a St. Charles Borromeo in the north of Italy; of a St. Theresa in Spain; and of a St. Francis of Sales and a St. Vincent of Paul, in Savoy and in France, nearly vies with that which entire orders have exercised.

This enumeration will suffice to prove what vigour, what fullness of life yet existed in the Catholic Church after all the losses she had sustained, and that the society of the Jesuits, however great might be its merits, and salutary its influence, was far from absorbing and concentrating within itself, as Novalis seems to insinuate, all the moral and intellectual energies of that Church. So far from the Jesuits being "the last bulwark of the Catholic Church," we may assert that never has the Divine aid been more abundantly lavished on that Church; never has she accomplished a more salutary change in the minds and feelings of men; never has Catholic genius achieved more splendid triumphs, particularly in the two countries where religion had been most violently assailed—France and Germany—than in the last thirty-seven years, during which, as is notorious, the influence of this order has been either absolutely null, or extremely feeble.

Our author proceeds to give the following sketch of the irreligious philosophy of the last century; a sketch in which a fine irony is united to a spirit of bold and vigorous generalization.

"The result of this modern way of thinking was called philosophy; and everything opposed to antiquity, especially every attack on religion, was included under that name. The original personal hatred to the Catholic creed was gradually turned into a hatred against the Bible,

* For this account of religious orders in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, consult Ritter's "*Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte*," pp. 172-3, first Part; also pp. 207-17, second Part. See also Hortig's and Döllinger's *Kirchengeschichte*, vol. iii. See also "*Die Römische Päpste*," von Ranke, vol. i. pp. 172-6. Helyot's "*Ordres Monastiques*," vol. viii. is the chief source from which the above-named writers have derived their information.

the Christian Faith, and finally, all religion. Nay, more, this hatred to religion, naturally and consistently enough, extended to all objects of enthusiasm: it stigmatized imagination and feeling; morality and love of art; the future as well as the past; debased man to the level of a mere physical being, bowed under the yoke of necessity, and converted the infinitely diversified music of the universe into the monotonous clapper of an immense mill, which, turned by the stream of chance, was a self-grinding mill, without miller or architect, a pure *perpetuum mobile*.

"One species of enthusiasm was, however, generously left to the poor human race, and indeed, made the indispensable criterion of all high intellectual refinement: this was an enthusiasm for this great, splendid philosophy, and especially for its priests, and its mystagogues. France was so happy as to be the seat and nursery of this new faith, which consisted of pure science. In the new Church, poetry was decried, yet poets were still found in it, who, for the sake of effect, made use of ancient ornaments, and ancient lights, yet thereby incurred the danger of warming the new system of the world with ancient fire. The more cunning members of this fraternity, knew immediately how to throw cold water on their hearers when they became warm. These new illuminators laboured incessantly to disenchant nature, the earth, the souls of men, and the sciences, of all poetry; to obliterate every trace of the holy; to vilify by their sarcasms the recollection of everything ennobling in human history, and to divest the world of all ornament and variety.

"In Germany, the business was carried on in a more skilful manner. The new enlighteners reformed the whole system of education; sought to give to the old religion a new, rationalist, and vulgar sense, while they carefully effaced from it all mystery and miracle. They exhausted all the resources of erudition, in order to cut off recourse to history, while they kindly endeavoured to exalt history itself into a good bourgeois household picture of domestic manners. God was made the passive spectator of this great affecting drama, acted by the learned; and was at its close, solemnly to entertain and admire the poets and the players! The common people were a peculiar object of predilection to these enlighteners, and they were fashioned by them into a polite enthusiasm; and thus a new European fraternity—the philanthropists and illuminés—arose. Pity that nature remained still so marvellous and inconceivable; so poetical and so infinite, in despite of all these attempts to modernize her! Did any ancient superstition in a higher world, or in what related thereto, emerge to the surface of society, a cry of alarm was immediately raised on all sides, and if possible, the dangerous spark was smothered in its ashes by philosophy and wit; still was toleration the watchword of these illuminators, and in France especially, was synonymous with philosophy.

"The whole history of this modern infidelity is extremely remarkable, and furnishes the clue to an understanding of all the prodigious events of our own times. * * *

Long would the celestial fire of religion have blazed forth; long would all the crafty plans of illuminism have been made void, had not the influence and oppression of the secular power come to their aid. But at the moment when discord sprang up among these rulers and these literati, when the whole fraternity of the enemies of religion became divided, religion necessarily arose as a reconciling and awe-commanding member; and this resurrection, should it even be still not so perceptible as we could wish, must be hailed and announced by every friend of Christianity. That the moment of her resurrection is arrived, and that the very occurrences which appeared most opposed to her re-animation, nay, which seemed to threaten her total destruction, have turned out to be the most favourable symptoms of regeneration, no historical mind will be disposed to question. True anarchy is the generative element of religion. Out of the annihilation of all existing institutions she raises her glorious head, as the new foundress of the world. * * *

“The spirit of God moves over the face of the waters, and a heavenly island emerges visible above the receding waves, to form the abode of renovated humanity.”—pp. 199-201.

The author exposes the futility of all attempts on the part of the modern revolutionists, to construct a permanent system of government, partly, because they reject all the historical traditions, recollections, and institutions of the past; and partly, because they sever the state from all connexion with religion. After noticing some more cheering symptoms, which in France and elsewhere seemed to indicate a return of a better order of things—some faint glimmerings, which, amid the deep gloom of that period, appeared to announce the coming of a glorious day, Novalis turns to his own Germany, and hails with pleasure the better direction which German literature and German science were then beginning to take. How signally have his predictions been fulfilled!

“Of the other European countries, besides Germany, we can only predict, that with the *peace*, the pulse of a high religious life will begin to beat within them, and soon will absorb every worldly interest. In Germany, we can already point out with certainty the traces of a new world. Germany precedes the other European states with a slow but steady pace. While these are occupied with war, commercial speculation, and political factions, the German is industriously qualifying himself to take part in a period of higher civilization; and this steady progress must in course of time give him a great preponderance over others. In German science and art, we may perceive a vehement fermentation. A vast display of intellect strikes us on all sides. New and fresh mines are explored. Never were the sciences in better hands, and never did they excite at least greater expectations. Subjects are examined under all their various points of view; nothing

is left unsifted, uninvestigated, uncriticized. Everything has become matter for enquiry. Writers have grown more original, and more powerful: every ancient monument of history, every art, every science, finds friends and followers; is embraced with new ardour, and rendered more prolific. A matchless versatility; a wonderful profundity; a brilliant elegance; the most comprehensive learning, and a rich powerful imagination, are here and there found boldly united."—p. 203.

If from those blissful seats, which we trust it has now attained, the noble spirit of Novalis were to look down on his beloved country, surely it would experience a new joy on contemplating the happy fulfilment of these predictions. In the period which has elapsed since those prophetic words were written, the German literature and science have indeed achieved marvellous triumphs; triumphs which even in foreign countries are now recognized and celebrated. The fine arts have put forth an unwonted splendour to embellish and ennoble German life; while industry and commerce are daily pouring forth their treasures to minister to its convenience. In the sacred cause of national independence, the military prowess of Germany has been crowned with the most brilliant success: while, in despite of the jealousies and encroachments of arbitrary power on the one hand, and the wicked insane efforts of revolutionary democracy on the other, the cause of sound, temperate, constitutional liberty, has been making slow, but certain progress in Germany. Above all, that holy religion, after which Novalis had so ardently yearned, has been extending its influence, wider and wider over the land; and, while in many places, it hallows, pervades, and vivifies art, science, and policy, it has reacted on the Protestant world itself, and checked the progress of Rationalism, and awoke a feeling of piety, which will ultimately, we think, lead to the happiest results.

After some good observations on the new and better direction, which the natural sciences were then beginning to assume, our author turns to the political world, and makes the following admirable reflections. With what a calm, steady, piercing glance, does this youthful spirit look into the future! What serene wisdom, what noble moderation we find in his counsels! Youth is the age of petulant feelings, and rash, extreme opinions. Hence this very moderation; this tranquil self-collectedness of mind was not the least extraordinary quality of this precocious intellect.

"Let us now turn to the political spectacle which our times present. The old and new order of things are involved in a struggle: the weakness and defectiveness of former political institutions have been signally

displayed in many fearful phenomena. What if here, as in the sciences, a closer and more various intercourse and connexion between the European states may not be the object designed by Providence in this war! What if the hitherto slumbering energies of Europe may not be roused, Europe again be resuscitated, and a brotherhood of her nations be not at hand! Is the Hierarchy, perhaps, destined to form the ground-plot of this political edifice—the animating principle of this confederacy of states? It is impossible for the secular powers to establish themselves in a just equilibrium:—a third power, which is at once mundane and super-mundane, can alone solve this problem. Among the conflicting powers, no peace can be concluded—all peace is but illusive—a mere armistice. From the point of view taken by cabinets, and by vulgar opinion, no reunion is conceivable. Both the political parties, now engaged in conflict, possess mighty and necessary claims, and, impelled by the spirit of the age, they must bring them forward. Both represent inextinguishable energies inherent in the human breast. *There we find devotion to antiquity—attachment to time-honoured institutions—love for ancestral monuments, and the old glorious heritage of the State, and the joy of obedience: there the kindling feelings of liberty—the exalting hope of a more extended field of action—the charm of youth and novelty—unfettered intercourse with all our fellow-citizens—pride in the power of human exertions—satisfaction in the possession of personal rights, and the life-stirring sense of citizenship.* Let neither party hope to annihilate the other—all conquests are here unavailing, for the inward capital of every empire lies not behind earthly ramparts, and cannot be stormed.”—pp. 206-7.

These words, which in 1799 had such a fearful import, are far from having lost their application in our own times. Would to God, indeed, they could be everywhere heard! would to God, they could pass into the life and feelings of nations! Then what useless contests, what interminable civil broils, what bloody wars, what havoc, what misery, would the nations of Europe be spared! Then would the exclusive pretensions, the mutual arrogance, the impracticable projects, the wild exaggerated opinions of hostile political factions be moderated, controlled, and reconciled. Then, under the sanction of our holy Church, order and liberty would solemnize a sacred, indissoluble alliance—and from that alliance, contentment, industry, wealth, and learning, would spring to diffuse their blessings over nations.

After having described the political evils of the age, our author points out the remedy, and the only remedy, existing for them.

“Who knows whether there has been enough of warfare? But never will it cease, till the palm-branch be grasped, which a spiritual power can alone extend. So long will blood continue to flow over Europe, until nations shall become conscious of the fearful frenzy,

that urges them round in a vicious circle, and until touched and softened by celestial music, they shall return in motley crowds to their ancient altars, perform works of peace, and, on the reeking battle-plain, amid tears of joy, solemnize the festival of peace, the great repast of love. Religion alone can resuscitate Europe, can give security to nations, invest Christendom with new glory, and reinstate her in her old pacific functions."—p. 207.

After thus commenting on the political evils of his age, and on the remedies which the Church alone was capable of applying to them, our author concludes his interesting treatise with the following beautiful passage, wherein the excellence of our holy religion is celebrated, and its final triumph, not only in Europe, but throughout the universe, most unequivocally foretold.

"A vital Christianity was the old Catholic Faith. Its all-presence in life—its love for art—its profound humanity—the indissolubility of its marriages—its adaptation to human wants—its joy in voluntary poverty, obedience, and fidelity; as these are the primary traits of its institutions, so they undeniably stamp it as a genuine religion.

"The other portions of the globe await Europe's reconciliation and resurrection, in order to enlist under the banners of Christianity, and become members of this celestial kingdom. Must there not be soon in Europe a multitude of truly religious minds? must not all true friends of religion sigh to behold this heaven upon earth? and long to meet together, and attune a holy chorus of love?

"Christianity must again become living and efficacious, and must again form herself into a visible Church, without regard to territorial limits, that she may receive into her bosom all souls thirsting after divine truth, and become the mediator of the old and new order of things.

"She must again pour over nations her old horn of benediction. From the sacred womb of a venerable European Council, Christendom will spring up regenerated, and the great business of religious resuscitation will be conducted according to a divine, all-embracing plan."—p. 208.

We have dwelt so long on this charming little work, that we have small space left for noticing, as we promised, the author's miscellaneous thoughts on religion, politics, and literature. We shall commence with his æsthetic meditations, and extract a few of the most interesting specimens.

What boundless poetry is in the following!—

"It is not merely the diversified colours, the gladsome tones, and the warm air, which so enraptures us in spring:—it is the still prophetic spirit of infinite hopes—a presentiment of many joyous days, of the happy existence of multifarious creatures—the anticipation of higher and eternal fruits and flowers, and an undefined sympathy with a world cheerfully unfolding around us."—p. 129.

What a cluster of pearls are the following thoughts !—

“ Sculpture, music, and poetry, stand in the same relation towards each other, as the epos, the ode, and the drama.”

“ The romance is, as it were, the ‘ Mythology of History.’ ”

“ Sculpture and music are arts diametrically opposed. Painting forms a species of transition from the one to the other.”—p. 129.

What an admirable definition is the following !—

“ The theatre is the *active* reflection of man upon himself.”—p. 166.

At the time when the passages we are about to cite were written, the poetry of Shakspeare had not been so deeply studied, nor was it so generally felt and understood, as in our times. Yet, after the many elaborate and profound criticisms, which the age has produced in England, France, and above all, Germany, the following remarks on our great English bard will, we think, be perused with pleasure and interest :—

“ When we speak of the design and artificial structure of ‘ Shakspeare’s dramas, we must not forget that art belongs to nature, and, as it were, only a self-contemplating, self-imitating, and self-forming nature. The art of a highly-gifted genius is very distinct from the artificial refinement of the mere reasoning spirit. Shakspeare was no calculator—he was no scholar—but he was a powerful, richly-endowed intellect, whose feelings and works, like the productions of nature, bear the stamp of thought, and in which the latest and acutest observer may still find new coincidences with the infinite organism of the universe, agreements with subsequent opinions, affinities to the higher energies and senses in humanity. Shakspeare’s writings are symbolical, and variously significant, simple and inexhaustible, like nature’s products ; and a more unfitting name could not be applied to them, than to call them works of art, in the narrow, mechanical signification of that word.

“ In the historical dramas of Shakspeare, there is a constant struggle between poetry and prose. Common life appears witty and dissolute, while the heroic life seems stiff and tragic. Low life is constantly opposed to high, sometimes in a tragic manner, sometimes by way of parody, and often for the sake of contrast. History (that is to say, history in the poetical sense) is represented in these pieces—history reduced to dialogue ; precisely the reverse of real history ; and yet history as it ought to be, prophetic and synchronical.”—pp. 136-7.

The following remarks on oratory are excellent :—

“ In a true oration, the orator plays all parts, in order to create surprise, to consider his subject in a new point of view, to practise a sudden illusion on his hearers, or to work conviction on their minds. An oration is an extremely lively, ingenious, alternating representation of the inward contemplation of a subject. Sometimes the orator interrogates, sometimes he replies ; next he carries on a sort of dialogue,

then he narrates; now he appears to forget his subject, in order suddenly to recur to it; now he feigns conviction, in order more cunningly to wound his opponent; now he puts on an air of artlessness, or courage, or pity; now he apostrophizes this subject, now that; sometimes it is a peasant he addresses, sometimes even an inanimate thing. In short, an oration is a *drama soliloquized*. It is only the natural, straight-forward orator, who deserves that name. The timid or declamatory speaker is no orator. The genuine oration is in the style of the high comedy, interwoven occasionally with passages of lofty poetry, but else running on in the clear, simple prose of common life."—p. 137.

Here follows a recipe of the ingredients which make up a poet:—

"To the poet are necessary a calm, attentive sense, inclinations which divert him from worldly business and petty concerns, and a state of life devoid of anxiety; also much travel, acquaintance with various descriptions of men; a rapid, intuitive apprehension, a happy memory, the gift of language, no tenacity to any one object, no stormy passions, but an expansive susceptibility."—p. 164.

What poet ever possessed the requisites and qualities of his art here laid down, in a more eminent degree than our great and amiable Sir Walter Scott?

Again:—

"The separation of philosophy and poverty is productive of mutual disadvantage. It is the sign of a diseased constitution."—p. 165.

"Poetry is the hero of philosophy. Philosophy exalts poetry into a principle—it teaches us the value of poetry."—*ibid*.

We shall now lay before our readers some extracts from our author's reflections on moral and metaphysical subjects.

What depth and beauty in the following reflection!

"The mysterious charm of the virgin—that which renders her so unspeakably attractive—is the presentiment of maternity, the anticipation of a future world, which yet slumbers within her, and is one day to spring out of her. She is the aptest emblem of futurity."—p. 179.

Again:—

"Marriage designates a new, a higher period of love—the social or the living love."—*ibid*.

All our author's reflections on marriage are characterized by singular purity and delicacy of feeling, and elevation of thought. It was a favourite topic, which the circumstances of his life had caused him deeply to meditate upon. The following is also characteristic:—

"Shame is a sense of profanation. Friendship, love, and piety,

should be mysteriously treated. It is only in very rare, confiding moments, we should speak of them. Many things are too tender to be thought of—many more, to be expressed.”—p. 184.

Some of the religious reflections are very beautiful. There is a deep pathos in the following passage:—

“Martyrs are spiritual heroes. *Every man hath indeed his years of martyrdom.* Christ was the great martyr of the human race: through Him hath martyrdom first received its mysterious holiness and deep significancy.”—p. 196.

“Our whole existence was intended to be one divine service.”—p. 194.

“The Holy Spirit is more than the Bible. He should be our teacher in Christianity, not the dead, earthly, ambiguous letter.”—p. 197.

“A certain degree of retirement appears necessary to foster the higher feelings within us; and hence a too extended intercourse with men will stifle many a holy seed, and chase away those gods, who fly the restless tumult of dissipated societies, and the pursuit of vulgar cares.”

“It is among men we must seek for God. In human occurrences, human thoughts, and human impressions, the Lord of Heaven most clearly reveals himself.”

How well did Novalis express the yearnings of his own beautiful spirit in the following words!

“Philosophy is the true home-sickness—the longing to return to our father’s house.”

The following, too, is very profound:—

“Philosophy is fundamentally anti-historic—it proceeds from the necessary and the future to the real—it is the science of the general sense of divination—it explains the past from the future; while in history the reverse is the case.”

Novalis belonged, as our readers may have already observed, to that class of politicians, who in Germany are denominated adherents of “*corporative* principles”—men who, alike averse to despotism and democracy, assert, against the disorganizing tyranny of either, the freedom and stability of all the great social corporations. The Catholic clergy, maintained in the full independent exercise of all their spiritual rights and jurisdiction—the amplest toleration for all dissenting sects—a royalty hallowed by religion, ennobled by historical recollections, deeply rooted in the affections of the people, not arrogantly encroaching, like the modern sovereignty, on the liberties and privileges of the other orders of the state, but preserving inviolate their legitimate rights and interests—an aristocracy zealous alike for the prerogatives of the crown and the liberties of the people,

representing in itself the glory of past ages, and yet constantly recruited by new infusions of popular talent, wealth, and virtue —lastly, a democracy, active, intelligent, free-spirited, devoted to the Church, attached to royalty, respecting the aristocracy, yet bold in the assertion of its own rights, at once regulated in its movements, and secured in its independence by well-organized municipal corporations: such constitute the object of the desires and efforts of the politicians we allude to. The most distinguished chiefs of this school, are, F. Schlegel, Görres, Stolberg, and Adam Müller; and when we were in Germany, we found these political principles generally advocated by the most zealous and enlightened Catholics of that country. On the other hand, the monarchical absolutism of Richelieu and Louis XIV, which found so many servile copyists among the continental sovereigns of the eighteenth century (however that system might often be ennobled by a paternal mildness of administration, and adorned with all the refinements of courtesy, and the elegances of literature), we find these honest Germans generally condemn and repudiate, as one injurious to the Church, fatal to liberty, and ultimately destructive to royalty itself. These political principles are adopted also by many enlightened Protestants, especially those who are versed in the history of the Middle Age, who have a strong leaning towards Catholicism, like John von Müller and our author himself. If the reader will be pleased to bear in mind the foregoing observations, he will then, perhaps, more easily perceive the drift of the following passages, which otherwise might appear obscure.

“The time will come ere long, when men will feel generally convinced, that no king can exist without a republic, and no republic without a king: that both are inseparable, like body and soul, and that a king without a republic, and a republic without a king, are words without meaning. Hence, with a genuine republic a king ever arose, and with a genuine king a republic.”—p. 172.

“The republic and the monarchy should be bound together by an act of union. There are several intermediate forms of government, which must necessarily be included in that union.”—p. 172.

“The state has ever been instinctively constituted according to the relative views and knowledge of human nature. The state has ever been a *macroanthropos*, or great man: the guilds were the members, or particular functions, of the body politic; the estates of the realm were its faculties. The nobility was the moral, and the priesthood the religious, faculties; while the literati constituted the intelligence, and the king the will, of the state. So that every state has ever formed an allegorical man.”—p. 174.

We shall conclude our extracts with the following passage, which is not more beautiful than it is true.

"A throne overturned is like a falling mountain, which incrushes the plains, and leaves ruins and a dead sea behind, where once were fruitful fields and joyous habitations."—p. 173.

In conclusion, we do not think we can form a better estimate of the character and genius of Novalis, than by comparing him with his illustrious friend and associate, Frederick Schlegel. Both had received from nature a vigour of imagination, and a depth and originality of understanding, rarely equalled; and these natural qualities were in both strengthened and matured by all the resources of learning. Both were endowed with the same amiable sensibility—with hearts open to every noble and generous impression; and both were distinguished for an earnestness of religious feeling, which in one was crowned with the possession of that truth, so long and so ardently sought after. Yet in these two spirits, so similar, so homogeneous, that they would seem as if cast by nature from the same mould, a difference is discernible. Novalis was more remarkable for subtlety of perception; — Schlegel for solidity of judgment. Both possessed perhaps the same wonderful versatility of genius; yet we very much doubt, whether, had the life of Novalis been spared, he would ever have attained that power of controlling and concentrating his forces on a subject—in other words, that mental harmony, which was Schlegel's most striking characteristic. In the mode and direction of their studies, there are also points of divergence. Novalis, with an impatient avidity, grasps at every branch of the tree of science; strives to embrace at once metaphysics, poetry, history, physiology, and mechanics, till his intemperate study, added to his bitter disappointment in love, undermines his naturally feeble constitution, and consigns him to an early tomb: Schlegel, on the contrary, devotes his youth to an almost exclusive study of philology, criticism, and art, never venturing on metaphysical speculations, till he has made himself well acquainted with preceding systems of philosophy, and, above all, become deeply imbued with the spirit of Plato. By this well-regulated application, he successively masters many departments of literature and science, and lays in stores of the most various learning, such as few men have ever possessed.

In respect to style, we shall not find in Novalis that beautiful clearness and elegance, that classical purity and dignity of language, which characterizes even the earliest writings of his friend, and for which he was probably indebted to his careful study of the Greek models. The style of Novalis is remarkable for poetical richness, variety, and a peculiar felicity of verbal combination; yet it is not unfrequently, especially in the didactic

pieces, disfigured by a technical obscurity of phraseology, or a too colloquial familiarity of expression. But these are defects, which, in his maturer years, he would in all probability have corrected.

In the life of these two distinguished friends, there was the same singular contrast. Schlegel threads his way carefully between the by-paths of Rationalism on the one side, and the fearful abysses of Pantheism on the other, till he at last gains the lofty mount, on which the temple of eternal truth is built. His less fortunate friend has hardly set his foot in the porch of the Catholic Church—he has caught but a distant glimpse of the glories which radiate from her sanctuary, and but indistinctly heard the celestial harmonies that resound within her walls, when he is snatched away by the pitiless hand of death. But we have every reason to hope, that that spirit so pure, so earnest in its inquiries after truth, has elsewhere attained the reward which was denied to it here; and that those mists of error, from which while on earth it had not wholly disengaged itself, have long disappeared before the glorious visions of eternity!

ART II.—*Deux Chanceliers d'Angleterre. Bacon de Vérulam et S. Thomas de Canterbéry.* Par A. F. Ozanam. Paris. 1836.

“FOR three centuries,” says M. le Comte de Maistre, “history has been only one grand conspiracy against truth.” There are few, at this day, even among our own fellow-countrymen, that will not subscribe, in part at least, to this sentiment. The bitterness of polemics, which wasted Christendom from the beginning of the schism that disfigures the annals of the sixteenth century, could have afforded but little encouragement to the culture of true historic philosophy, even though it had not exercised itself in corrupting those sources from which alone such philosophy derives its nutriment. In truth, by far the greater number of modern historians, writing in those countries where the Reformation succeeded best in gaining an establishment, seem to have regarded this noble province of the human intellect in no other estimation, than as affording a convenient arena whereon to bait the suppressed remnant haply still clinging to the ancient faith of their common ancestors. For a while, too, the game was a safe one. To have vanquished his antagonist would have little served the Catholic, conversing as of

yore in the pressed arena, while from the multitude on every side around him was raised the shout, "Christianos ad leones!" Hence every undertaker of history, from David Hume up to Fox, the pseudo-martyrologist, had in his turn his fling at the proscribed—undisturbed save by the savage rejoicing of those for whose prejudices he wrote. The Catholics, on the other hand, were as dormant in this field of distinction as their enemies were active. While the latter sowed tares among the wheat, the former slept; and not till the fearful scenes of the last century, and the bloody triumphs of a superficial *philosophism* had intervened, were they warned of the inconceivable error which they had committed, in abandoning to the undisputed dominion of their foemen, among other domains of science, the very battlefield on which their claims upon the human race might have been vindicated with the least opposition, and the victory most honourably won. From time to time, beyond a doubt, there did appear a Catholic history of past or contemporaneous events; and now and then might be gathered from these works much that redeemed the historic character of the age, or gave presage of a better one to come; but the *incubus* of the Reformation, and the writers whom it had produced, lay heavy upon the literature of even the Catholic countries, and while many of their philosophers worshipped Locke, their historians seem to have paid court to Clarendon. And thus, despite the weighty folios and voluminous quartos which daily issued from the shelves of her booksellers, Europe saw herself without one single historian; and though she heard in every variety of style the chronicled narration of the various passages of her history, she found not in her sons that philosophy which alone could instruct her in the truths of which they were only so many examples. The body was there without the soul to animate it.

But these things are of the past. The supineness of Catholic talent was at length aroused to life and energy by the terrible encroachments of a new foe—the antichristian school of the eighteenth century. By a mysterious alchemy, the providence of God fails not to extract from the most hostile of elements the materials of good, and to transmute, into the means of usefulness, the measures which may have been intended by human presumption for the purpose of His detriment. And, even so, the thirst of research and advancement was indeed at first excited by the preaching of Encyclopædists, because it promised to conduct to the downfall of Christianity; but when that thirst had tasted of the stores which these supplied it, and had known their gall and scantiness, refusing to imbibe more of that instruction, it sought out the well-springs from which our first fathers drank, now

gushing forth again with the renewed vigor of a long pent flood; for thence only was it able to derive a stream of science which should more than satisfy the craving. It is not our purpose to enumerate the illustrious members of the galaxy of Catholic glory which now irradiates the realms of history, or of science in general, in the countries of the Continent. The names of a Le Maistre, a Bonald, a Chateaubriand, a Schlegel, and a Müller, are doubtless not the only names which are familiar to the reader of modern history. They form distinguished units of a phalanx which has wrested the empire of narrative from the hands of our foes, and has put to the rout the anti-Catholic misstatements and interpretations of the past, which, till now, had formed the chief safeguards of error and fanaticism.

It is with grateful feelings, too, that we are bound to add the circumstance, that this restoration of truth to the department of history is by no means the exclusive work of Catholic hands. The spirit of philosophic justice has animated some among the greatest of those minds, which, unhappily, walk not in religious unison with our own, to the noble labour of reparation to the "ages of faith," and of resistance to modern misrepresentation. For, besides M. Guizot in France, whose enlightened views upon the middle ages—that fertile topic of anti-Catholic declamation—are beginning, we are glad to perceive, to attract the attention of even our own reading public*,—there are other Protestant philosophers of history, such as Voigt, the able historian of S. Gregory the Seventh, and Hürter, the triumphant defender of Innocent the Third, who have nobly played their parts in the great historical atonement which we behold in progress. And though England cannot as yet boast of a single historic philosopher, properly so called, and has therefore been reduced to rely for the demonstration of the *word*, which is the key to her own annals, upon the labours of some of the great Continental leaders of the science—the masterly history† which Dr. Lingard produced—has won many to think at least more charitably of their own forefathers, and has persuaded into the field a host of historical treatises of all dimensions, more or less favourable to the cause which he himself was the first to vindicate with system and precision. Why should it not be so? The most touching memorials of the prowess of God's Church in every domain of merely human intelligence, throughout the ages of barbarism or feudality, are those which Catholic England

* A translation of M. Guizot's *Lectures on the Civilization of Europe* is now being published by Mr. Macrone.

† We hail with pleasure the appearance of a new edition of this excellent work, revised and augmented, in monthly volumes, with illustrations. When the publication shall be complete, we hope to have the pleasure of inserting a notice of it.

affords. The stately monuments of art which cover the sites of time-hallowed recollections—the political institutions—the municipalities—the lion-hearted honesty and sturdy independence which still characterize the Englishman—all these, in their turns, have been the offspring of the spirit which once gained for this island, among nations, in days when it was thought no disgrace to be Catholic, the highest meed of religious excellence.

“It is singular, that we have a letter addressed by one of the oldest popes to a sovereign of this kingdom, which, even if it be not allowed all the antiquity attributed to it, must yet be considered anterior to the Conquest, in which he expressly says, that the constitution and government of all the other nations of Europe are necessarily less perfect than that of England, because they are based on the Theodosian, or an originally heathen code, while the Constitution of England has drawn its forms and provisions from Christianity, and received its principles from the Church. It is remarkable, that, perhaps, no other country has such a steady administration of the laws, in consequence of the admission into it of that very principle, which corresponds to the unwritten or traditional code of the Church. For, besides the statute law of the kingdom, we have also the common law, that law of traditional usage now recorded in the decisions of courts, and in other proper and legitimate documents, precisely in the same manner as the Church of Christ possesses a series of traditional laws, handed down from age to age, written, indeed, now in the works of those who have illustrated her constitution and precepts, and demonstrated in every part of her system, but still differing from the Scripture much in the same way as the unwritten differs from the written law.”*

Hence the reason—independently of the deposing power, to which we shall refer in the course of this article—of those remarkable coincidences which exhibit to us throughout the middle ages the continuous alliance binding the oppression of the subject with the persecution of the Church. Hence we remark the sufferings of religion under the mailed grasp of the Norman race, universally responded to by the groans of an oppressed people. Hence the impious revelries of Rufus, the bloodstained schisms of Henry Plantagenet, and the apostacy of Sansterre. And, on the other hand, in the minds of the depressed people, the sense of their own wrongs was aggravated by their sympathy with the sufferings of religion, and their appeal to liberty consecrated by the recollection of those at whose hands they had first received it. “Give us,” was the cry of the Saxon race, “give us the laws of good Saint Edward the Confessor.” And the cry was caught up and repeated by such of their Norman intruders, and they were many, as had learned to identify themselves

* Dr. Wiseman's “Lectures on the Doctrine and Discipline,” &c. Vol. i. p. 116.

with the memories of their adopted land, and to love her usages; and thus, as is well remarked by the young and generous champion of Faith, who is, not the less, the learned and eloquent friend of universal freedom—the Comte de Montalembert*—did Stephen Langton “place himself at the head of the barons revolted and united in the *army of God and Holy Church*, who tore from the king the celebrated great Charter—base of that English constitution which moderns have so much admired; doubtless forgetting that it was but the fruit of the feudal organization; and that this very charter, far from being an innovation, was but a restoration of the laws of St. Edward, a confirmation of the public law of all Europe at that epoch, founded upon the respect for all rights ancient and individual. * * *

And the nation completed the establishment of its liberties, under the conduct of the noble son of Simon de Montfort, brave and pious as his father—vanquished and slain at the end of his career, but not before having made a crusade of this popular war, and having introduced the deputies of the people into the first political assembly which ever bore the name—so famous since—of a British Parliament.”

We have said that the cause of our Catholic forefathers has been vindicated with praiseworthy skilfulness by Continental pens. The latest of those works of such interest to these islands, appeared in Paris last year, under the title which we have prefixed to the present article. At a time when the political principles of Ireland form the subject of jealous scrutiny from those who are too prone to regard through an exaggerating medium every trait in the character of her well-cherished creed, until they shall fix on some one which may be wrung into a plausible objection to the course of justice, and the secured and peaceful enjoyment of her newly-recognized rights, we cannot too earnestly invite our brethren at home and abroad, to the imitation of the example set them by M. Ozanam. We have too long “trembling inhabited” our own circle, and acted a defensive part; we have repelled, doubtless, one after another, the desultory attacks which the enemies of our freedom have levelled against us, in the individual persons of our saints and heroes: but we have remained there, and have permitted the foe, by an unmolested retreat, to effect new annoyances and incursions upon our frontier. It is not enough to negative, however triumphantly, the reproaches made against our loyalty to the commonwealth, or our capacity for civic duties; we ought to do more than this;—we ought to show—for we *can*

* Histoire de St. Elizabeth (Edit. de Louvain), p. xxvi.

show it,—that in times when the people's voice was hushed in the slumber of feudality, and when the now matured restraints upon the crown's prerogative and the barons' turbulence were as yet only in the germ of childhood,—when humanity of herself could no longer oppose anything to the wildness of material force, threatening to overwhelm the whole of Christendom, as it had already swept away the mighty Empire, with its arts, its arms, and its laws;—that in those momentous times, the task of order, progress, and civilization, too great for the feebleness of humanity, was accepted most generously, and as gloriously achieved, by the only power competent to its performance, and that that power was the *Church*! A series of parallels between the sixteenth and part of the seventeenth centuries, on the one hand, the palmy days of that policy, which exalted state-craft to the heights of veneration, and made religion a dead letter, and adherence to its maxims a badge of disloyalty; and, on the other hand, the great days when the Church stood between the victor and the vanquished, and shielded with her mantle, by turns, the misgoverned people, and the oppressed prince; and consecrated the truce with holy sacrifices, or ratified the just chastisement of offenders by the terms of the anathema:—this is the plan which we recommend to the attention and adoption of the lettered Catholic, who would be a witness to the final and honourable, though somewhat tardy, vindication of the middle ages from the aspersions of his own calumniators. We would not be misunderstood. The temporal power which the Church possessed at that epoch, and wielded for the good of Christendom, while it was admirably fitted for the iron age of power, and the helpless infancy of the English constitution, died with those times, and cannot now be revived amongst us, without a very signal mischief to the whole frame of our political and social organization. The exigencies which gave it birth are no more, and as its own mission has been long ago most gloriously discharged, we have no wish to witness its revival. To render justice to the past is our only aim, and we are sure that M. Ozanam, the able author of the book before us, had no other motive for his labours. We gave in a former number a short account of *Les Deux Chanceliers*. The parallel between the “ages of faith” and the era of modern innovation, is here traced out through an exact and judicious contrast between Bacon, the first of the sages of earth, and St. Thomas à Becket. Appreciating, as much as his warmest admirer could have wished, the philosophical excellence of Bacon, the author exposes how irreconcilable is the life of the *man* with the maxims of the *philosopher*; and thence takes occasion to show, that the broken harmony of the soul demands something

more to re-establish the concert of the will with the understanding, than the wisdom of the loftiest intelligences that ever have walked on earth.

"Their doctrines have brought back the understanding into the better ways, they have formed it to high and vast speculations; they have enlarged, strengthened, it, with all the logical power which is within them; but within them, there is not a power of love, and that is the only one which the will can obey. Hence the will escapes them; she abides in the abysses of corruption, whither she had sunk: she abides there, given up to those sorceresses who intoxicate her with disgraceful enjoyments and painful pleasures, and who are so well called passions. Thus that fatal divorce which is beheld within all souls reappears, more notorious, more melancholy, than ever, within the soul of the philosopher: there are in him two lives, that of the head, and that of the heart; it is the statue of gold with the feet of clay; it is a divided man, that is to say, a helpless one."—p. 250.

But on the other hand

"Christianity has had pity on our nature: it has taken two rays from heaven, of which one is called faith, the other charity, and these two are but of one and the same flame; but the one is the light, the other the warmth. By faith, Christianity possesses itself of the understanding, and draws it from its darkness; by charity, it regenerates the will, and raises it up from its turpitudes. That which it makes credible to the first, it causes the second to love: it makes both to meet upon their path, to tend together toward one same end, which is God. Thus it re-establishes the primitive harmony of the soul; and that the harmony may no more be troubled, that faith may stagger not, that charity may never fail, a society is ordained, believing, loving, harmonious; and that society is the Church. This is the origin of that immoveable firmness of thought, of that immense expansion of love, which makes the saints. The saint is a man cast of bronze, but of animated bronze; he is *one* man, that is to say, a mighty man."—p. 251.

The above passages, transferred to our pages from the conclusion of this most interesting volume, contain a sufficiently complete portraiture of the author's plan. Never have we seen a happier choice of examples. We see the youthful son of Nicholas Bacon, the Keeper of the Seals, after lisping flattery in the years of early childhood, and imbibing with wondrous precocity an instinct of public business,—attain, at the young age of nineteen, to his first employment, that of secret agent between Elizabeth and her ambassador in Paris. Then, "disdaining the confined and dusty career of the bar," he concentrates his whole attention on diplomacy, and composes works, which Machiavel might have coveted, upon the demeanour which a shrewd and emulous courtier should make it his pride to observe. But these were not assuredly intended for the vulgar,

nor for those whose good-will it was his interest to win ; discarding magnanimity, therefore, which, in his own words, was “ but a poetical virtue,” he penned for the latter eulogy upon eulogy, with a flattery almost fulsome enough to have sated the vanity of Elizabeth herself. To her praise the English language seemed inadequate ; Virgil was courted to assist the panegyrist ; and a whole hemistich was culled from the *Æneid* for every single perfection which his creative eye discovered in the person of his idol. Yet he failed in his main object ; the perquisites of office were denied him during her reign, although his pride was gratified with the empty title of Counsellor Extraordinary to Her Majesty. The public scorn and execration which avenged upon him the fall of the noble and popular Devereux, Earl of Essex, his patron and benefactor, whom he forsook in the adverse tide of fortune, and whose death he publicly leagued with Coke in compassing, that he might build upon the ruins of that house his own sure way to greatness, seem to have deterred the crafty queen from conferring trust and honour upon one, whose great usefulness in her service would be very considerably impaired by his want of character among the multitude. Nevertheless, he continued to observe mankind, and wrote more books of political morality of the same edifying cast as before, till at last he was enabled to afford in his own person a satisfactory test of the goodness of their doctrine. James I, whom he proclaimed by turns a Trismegistus and a Solomon, was not insensible to his claims ; and under this prince we behold him, after rising from a host of other dignities to the successive posts of Attorney and Solicitor-General, at length filling up the measure of his ambition by the exchange of the Keepership of the Seals for the Lord Chancellorship of England, with the titles of Baron Verulam and Viscount St. Alban’s, “ and seating himself—impure courtier—in the chair of Thomas Morus.” Two years, however, reduced him from the apogee of his ambition to the depths of infamy. The man, who, making of immorality a science, had formed its rules into a complete system of practice, and had used it as the sole instrument of his purposes, thought it not unseemly in the highest judge of the realm to adhere to the same course. The court of James certainly afforded him the countenance of much example. The Commons were not so compliant. Not yet at liberty to strike at higher game, they seem to have bestirred themselves with zeal in the repression of individual abuses and malversations of office. The Chancellor was impeached before his peers for having accepted bribes from suitors in his court, and “ the Commission charged to draw up his process, established that on twenty-seven different occasions,

he had received more than £6,000 sterling, furniture, diamonds, gratuitous loans, and even a dozen of buttons, for to that insatiable cupidity, all prey was good." Having pleaded guilty to the charges, with a prayer that their lordships "would be merciful to a broken reed," he received for his sentence, on the 3rd May, 1621:—first, to pay a fine of £40,000; secondly, to be imprisoned in the Tower during the king's good pleasure; thirdly, that he should be for ever incapable to fill any office, place, or employment, of a public character; and lastly, that he should never sit in Parliament, nor dwell within the precincts of the court. This sentence, severe, but not disproportionate to the offence, was remitted afterwards step by step, through the sovereign's indulgence; but he was never restored to office, in spite of the numberless letters which he addressed to James, in that phrase of sycoplancy which once had served him so well. In one of these, quoted by M. Ozanam, he compares the unworthy Stuart to the Creator, "who produceth and doth not destroy;" and full of this impiety, he exclaims: "Si tu deseris nos, perimus!" But

"The crowned passer-by did, like so many others; he let fall a penny into the beggar's hand, but he turned away his eyes with disdain, and did not invite him to follow to the palace. Bacon died in solitude, in 1626."

Thus ended the life of the philosopher of earth.

"It is that of Plato," observes our author, "crowned with flowers at the table of Dionysius; of Aristotle at Alexander's feet; of Cicero dishonouring his exile by a cowardly despair, or burning before Cæsar the debased perfume of his eloquence; of Seneca dying too late to expiate his familiarity with Nero; of Luther signing in favour of the Landgrave of Hesse the consecration of polygamy; of Voltaire admitted to the suppers of Frederick of Prussia; of the whole eighteenth century, and its unspeakable turpitudes."—p. 248.

But, on the other hand, we are presented with a history of the sainted Archbishop of Canterbury, such as the lover of historic truth will welcome to his library. It is, besides, the most complete account of the martyr which the world has had; and furnishes, among other new matter, some precious and edifying particulars relating to his exile in Lyons, where his memory still lives in the local traditions of the lowly. The principal passages of St. Thomas à Becket's life, which have become the subject of Anglican aspersions, viz.: the suddenness of the change, which was operated in his whole life and conversation, by his elevation to the primacy—the opposition which he at once evinced to Henry's designs, at the price of that monarch's friendship,—and his appeal to the Holy See, and consequent flight into France—

are here presented in their true colours, not as claiming our indulgence, but much rather as claiming the admiration of the whole world for his faithfulness unto exile and martyrdom. At the time when he succeeded to the See of Canterbury, England and her Church were groaning beneath the "haughty descendants of sea-kings before whom every knee was bowed." The strange pretensions to interference in Church matters asserted by the Conqueror, had been extended by William Rufus and Henry I, who "possessed themselves of the revenues of vacant benefices; prolonged the widowhood of churches, to work it to the profit of the treasury; and attributed to themselves the rights of nomination and investiture." But the English clergy, under, among other great primates, their Lanfranc and St. Anselm, stood firm against the mailed ranks of their invaders; and Henry II had been bound, at his accession, by solemn oaths, to respect the immunities of the Church, recovered by her pastors during the stormy reign of Stephen. But the notorious deceitfulness and irreligion of the new prince—whose maxim it was, "That it is better to repent of one's words, than of one's works"—gave reason for the general dread of an invasion upon the Church, the more dangerous because of his singular ability. The expectation was verified. Upon Theobald's death, the king looked around him for one whose attachment to his person should secure his adherence to his secret designs, and his choice fell upon Becket, the Chancellor of his kingdom, bound to him as much by gratitude for favours conferred, as by the intimacy of mutual friendship. Him he named to the Holy See, as a worthy successor of Archbishop Theobald, and the Pope confirmed the selection. While opinions were divided as to the consequences of this elevation, its object alone "had seen the future unfold before him, more glorious than his detractors believed, more stormy than his friends augured. 'I know,' said he to the king, 'I know very surely that your mind will be turned away from me. For you will raise, and already you have raised, pretensions which I shall never be able to suffer, and my enviers will find means to interpose between you and me, and your old affection will be changed into an enmity which shall not end.' The king did not accept 'the oracle.'"^{*}—p. 130. The storm at last broke out. The refusal of St. Thomas and the bishops to sacrifice to Henry's pleasure their privileges of exemption from the civil tribunals—no slight one in those days, when penalties of life and limb, for even the most trivial offences, were of everyday occurrence in the feudal courts—a privilege, too, which they

^{*} *Quadrilogus*, cap. xi.

had enjoyed for centuries, led to farther issues. The mysterious demand next made of them, that the bishops should promise to observe *the royal customs*, was fairly met, after deliberation, by the answer, that they would so promise, *salvo ordine suo*; an exception, as our author well remarks, which had ever been made in episcopal oaths of fealty, and which was "the victorious exorcism whereby the Church repelled whatever of the servile there might have been in the obedience." But the bishops, terrified at the anger of the king, in an evil hour forced St. Thomas to yield to their importunities; and, in the unhappy council of Clarendon, to promise upon his troth, "that he would observe the customs *in good faith*." The Constitutions of Clarendon, which incorporate the English Church with the feudal system, were signed and sealed by the prelates on the following day, but St. Thomas, during the delay which had been granted him for examination, confounded by the sturdy reproof of his crosier-bearer, Edward Grim, repented of his past weakness, and referred himself to the Pope. Alexander III condemned the Constitutions, and those who had sworn to them; but praised the repentance of à Becket, and encouraged him to perseverance. The exhortation was heard. Leaving the consequences to God, he set at nought the Constitutions, and continued to enforce, with all the energy of his soul, the high prerogatives of his jurisdiction. At the parliament of Northampton, he was cited to answer for his conduct. The cowardice of the greater number of his prelates, and his own immortal constancy in those days of sore trial, are matter of history. Seated in the vestibule of that council chamber, attired in full pontificals, he bore unmoved the insults of the menials, until the parliament had concluded its deliberations, and the Earl of Leicester, at the head of the barons, came to announce his sentence. Then raising himself, he broke silence. "Son Earl, hearken thou thyself. Thou art not ignorant, my son, how dear and faithful to the king I was when I governed the matters of this world. It was, therefore, that it pleased him to raise me to the Archiepiscopal See of Canterbury, in spite, God knoweth, of my resistance, for I knew my weakness, and I submitted myself rather for the love of my king than for the love of my God. * * * My son, hearken again: Forasmuch as the soul is more precious than the body, in so much ought I to obey God rather than earthly kings. Neither law, nor reason, permit the sons to judge their father. Wherefore I decline the king's judgment, and thine, and that of the rest, not being able to be judged by any one after God but the Pope. I appeal before you all to his tribunal, and I withdraw me under the protection

of the Apostolic See and of the Church universal.' He retired, calm and majestic, amid the vociferations of the courtiers, and no one dared to stay him." (p. 148.)

In the Council of Tours, before Alexander III, himself an exile for conscience' sake, Saint Thomas pleaded his cause in person against the emissaries of Henry, who sought his deposition. The archbishop was confirmed in his See by the Sovereign Pontiff; and, therefore, from his cell at Pontigny, he condemned canonically the Constitutions of Clarendon, and launched the anathema against all those who adhered to them. The royal vengeance wreaked itself in a novel manner. The friends of the Saint, in number about 400, were spoiled of their property, and bound by oath to visit their exiled patron in the place of his sojourn. "Behold a being who devises for a bishop a torture more cruel than death; and that torture is, *to show him the poor whom he cannot succour—to surround him with heart-rending lamentations which he cannot console!*"

The rejection of an equivocal accommodation proposed to him by the tyrant, drew on him the displeasure even of his protector, Louis; and he was obliged to quit Pontigny for the "more free" country of the Lyonnais. From Lyons he addressed to the Pope, to his own suffragans, and to King Henry, those undying letters which have survived to our own days. We should but impair them by curtailment, and we have no space for a complete extract.

From Lyons he was recalled to England, by the series of happy coincidences which restored to Rome her pontiff, and left him free to exercise his power. Warned by the fate of Frederick of Germany, Henry trembled in his turn for his continental possessions, even although the servility of his island subjects left him at ease with respect to England. In a meadow at Freitville, appropriately named the "Traitor's Field," Saint Thomas was reconciled to his sovereign, and paid upon his bended knee the heartfelt obeisance of gratitude. Yet "that very morning Henry had sworn before some persons, that he never would give Thomas the kiss of peace. And in fact he did not give it."

St. Thomas returned to England; but the king had never designed to keep the word he had plighted. The dissolute and apostate seemed privileged to heap every insult upon the head of the primate, while the unruly bishops were countenanced openly by Henry. Great abuses and malversations had been introduced into every department of the Church; and St. Thomas applied himself unsparingly to root them out, and restore order to the sanctuary. His murder arrested his progress in this good work.

●

The venal prelates who refused him submission had carried their complaints to Henry; and the hint implied by the memorable words which followed, was not lost upon his slaves: "Cursed be those whom I nourish with my favour, if they cannot avenge me, and rid my realm of this turbulent priest!" Four knights undertook the deed. "Tradition reports, that the tree under which they met to conspire together, smitten with malediction, became withered up." They crossed to England, and on reaching Caunterbury entered the chamber of the Archbishop, and made no secret to him of their intentions. His fortitude did not permit him the cowardice of flight. In the evening, when he went into the church where the monks were chanting their office, he refused to suffer the gates to be closed, saying, "That it was not a fit thing to make a stronghold of God's house." The murderers appeared, and demanded "the traitor Archbishop." At this moment all his clerks fled except three, among whom was Edward Grim, his honest crosier-bearer. One knight, laying his hands on him, ordered him to follow him, as his prisoner; but the saint, plucking his mantle from the soldier's grasp, replied, "What you would do to me you shall do here." They summoned him to absolve the excommunicated bishops; "Until that they have complied with the holy canons, I will not absolve them," was his answer. Placing himself then in a kneeling posture, he proffered his last prayer: "To God, to Blessed Mary, to the holy patrons of this place, and to the blessed martyr Saint Denys, I commend my soul and the cause of the Church." "Upon this, a sword-cut wounded the crosier-bearer's arm, which attempted to shield the Archbishop, and grazed the head of the Archbishop himself; a second blow stretched him on the ground; a third clove in a large portion of the skull. And one of the murderers, inserting his sword, protruded the brain, and scattered it over the pavement." (p. 196.) Their next step was, of course, the pillage of the monastery.

Thus died the martyr, and thus, too, terminates the parallel between the saints of heaven and the Antæi of earth. For as M. Ozanam well expresses it,—

"The history of St. Thomas is that of many among the saints; it is that of many myriads of martyrs before the proconsuls, of Athanasius before Julian, of Ambrose before Theodosius, of Chrysostom before Arcadius, of Gregory VII before Henry IV, of Nepomucene before Wenceslas, of Bishop Fisher and Thomas Morus before Henry VIII; and also (why should I not say it?) of Pius VII before Napoleon. For at that time, we learned by a great example, that, in God's Church, the traditions of a just and religious independence were not destroyed."—p. 249.

We cannot better conclude this portion of our paper, than in the last words of the volume before us. "And now you have before you two great figures. Rationalism has made the one, Catholicism has made the other; it is for you to see to which of the two you will surrender your soul."

The influence of the middle ages upon the very frame-work of society, extended itself into the times which succeeded them. It would astonish the self-seeking generation of scorners, if they but knew to what amount they themselves are indebted to the opinions and institutions at which they love to rail, for much of that modern enlightenment which they are wont to praise, more in disparagement of the "dark ages," than from any seemly estimation of its worth. It required more than the rapine of the Tudors, or the falsehood of the Stuarts, could possibly effect, to destroy the manly and athletic character of the English mind; for the germ was first planted there by the hands of men in whom was the spirit of God, inspiring the soul with freedom; and it had been fostered for ages by kindly watchers, who scrupled not to pour forth their saintly life-blood for its sake when it lacked nourishment; and when its enemies at the last had slain the keepers, and sought to subdue to themselves this "fruit of their long watchings, they found its roots closely entwined and strongly embedded in the deep heart of the soil; so that, though it were easy to dishonour it, and shear it for a while of its loveliness, to eradicate it altogether was impossible. For the genuineness of freedom is understood by none but the faithful man; it is in the name of religion alone that he invokes her presence; his respect for the laws knows a better principle than the state-idolatry of the ancient empire, or the monstrous legalism of modern jurists. His fortitude is not insolent, nor his independence licentious; he is a citizen, because he is a Christian. The earliest writer upon our English constitution, the illustrious Fortescue, the Chancellor of Henry VI, has recorded the principles, which in his day were entertained upon the mutual duties and rights of the governors and the governed; than which, as Mr. Amos observes, "The sentiments of Algernon Sidney were not more inimical to the power of tyrants, or more repugnant to the abject language of the Oxford Decree, or that which disturbed the last moments of Russell."* The flag of our liberties was blessed by the anointed hands of bishops, and was spread to the breeze before the porch of the sanctuary.

We have no intention to detract one jot from the value of the praise, which is due to the book before us. We regret, however,

* "Fortescue de Laudibus," &c. By A. Amos, Esq., p. 43, n.

that our author's attention has not directed itself to the elucidation of one important point on which he has lightly touched, and which would have proved of most admirable service in this great work of love and justice—we mean the political supremacy over Christendom, which was, by the constitution of that magnificent commonwealth, swayed by the Popes during the whole period of the middle ages. Wherever this subject has been treated by those who know how to inspire themselves with the spirit of its epoch, the best results have never failed to follow. The warmest partisan of Right Divine on the one hand, and the sternest upholder of democracy upon the other, have reason to join in commendation of that marvellous scheme of international jurisprudence, which preserved order from the threatenings of anarchy, by uniting the civil into one common cause with the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and, at the same time, effectually forbade the tyranny of the rulers, by reminding them, as well as their people, that the abuse of that *power* which *was of God*, to purposes of impiety or injustice, at once determined its duration, and left the subject free to accept the dispensation from his natural allegiance, which, in such cases, was never withheld by the head of the Christian commonwealth. We are not to be scared by names. In our days, we hardly know the Tory who will deny to the subject the right of resistance in the extreme case of a tyrannical executive, but here the subject is reduced to decide for himself the moment at which his allegiance is cancelled and rebellion ceases to be treason, and at his own peril must he so decide. We do not mean to dispute the fitness of this state of things, but, we will ask, what would have been the state of Christendom, in the infancy of constitutions and constitutional ideas, and amid the general dearth of these means of improvement, in their regard, with which we are now readily and liberally furnished, if the decision of these important points of ethics had been entrusted to the indiscriminating multitude, and not rather vested in the Church, their faithful and enlightened guardian, from whom too they were wont to receive instruction in all their duties, and spiritual aids to discharge them. So, on the other hand, while the duty of obedience to the righteous ruler was carefully preached to the people, the presence of a superior in the palace of the prince, to warn him from injustice and irreligion, and to temper the sword of justice with the sweetness of mercy, and to soften the harshness of the latter by interpretation of the spirit, must undoubtedly be regarded by every unbiassed judgment, to have been of incalculable usefulness in every body politic. The mediation of the sovereign Pontiff between belligerent states, was always desirable to humanity in

those days of ruthless warfare, and was often successful in producing the most valuable results. But to stamp the seal of confirmation upon the temporal commission of the Church, it was necessary, beyond every thing, that its authority thus summarily to intermeddle with the affairs of kingdoms, should be recognized by those kingdoms themselves; for, otherwise, its benevolent designs must have been made void for want of the power to carry them into execution. Now, it should be remembered that the feudal system, as has been most ably shewn by Dr. Wiseman, in the *Annali delle Scienze Religiose*, vol. i. Mem. 2, *Settembre et Ottobre*, 1835, may be regarded under two points of view, "As the form of government of each nation in particular, or a strong and mighty bond, which, uniting together these different states, formed of them one single body—the state of Christendom." Under the first, "The same relations of right and duty which united the vassals to the lords, united the lords to the king; and moreover, in case of oppression or injustice, they might appeal to a higher judge." This judge was the Pope. The instances of appeals to the See of St. Peter in feudal questions, are very frequent in the annals of the times. But, it is under the second aspect of feudalism that the Papal supremacy appears more clearly recognized by the constitutions of the various Christian states. The prevailing notion of the times was, that "The Church and the state were, in substance, one sole and same thing; one great Christian state, although exteriorly they seemed to form two different societies." This doctrine is to be found in the express texts of the constitutions of the different kingdoms, together with the no less important doctrine that, "That double power, the spiritual and temporal, are both confided to the Pope, as Vicar of Christ, and visible head of the Church." From the supposed union of these two powers, it followed, as Eichorn, and after him, Dr. Wiseman, have observed, that the question so long agitated between the Church and the empire, was not the system itself, but the pre-eminence in that system; "that is to say, whether of the two should be subordinate in the feudal system to the other—the Pope or the emperor." But we recommend the whole of this very interesting paper of Dr. Wiseman, with the numerous authorities which he cites, to the attention of our readers.

Thus, the famous bugbear, with which the second childhood of our England has so long scared itself—the deposing power—was in fact, a wise political regulation, and nothing more. It is true, that the pens of its vindicators have treated it for the most part, as of divine institution, but this difficulty vanishes when we remind the reader, that the wisdom of our forefathers based

society altogether upon the divine appointment, imparting power to the human race, to be used by them, under such forms of polity, as they themselves might choose. The "social compact," raved of by Rousseau, and countenanced by Blackstone, who ought to have known better, would have been a fertile laughing-stock to our fathers, who believed, as we believe, that the savage state is *not* the state of nature. Hence the temporal headship of the Roman Pontiff, while it continued to form the cornerstone of the Christian commonwealth, was justly believed to be "of God."

That power was something more than nominal. While it lasted, the guarantees of freedom which the subject might chance to possess, were rarely violated, and even then, still more rarely was the wrong unredressed. Where there appeared to be no intermediate power between the throne and the subject, there the influence of the Church became of a more positive and direct agency. It has been well asked by Montesquieu, who on this point will be an unsuspected authority—

"Where would Spain and Portugal have been, since the loss of their laws, but for this power, which singly checks arbitrary government? Barrier ever good,—when there is none beside it: for as despotism is the cause of frightful ills to human nature, the very evil which limits it is a blessing. . . . The English, in favour of liberty, have removed all the intermediate powers which formed their monarchy. They have good reason to preserve that liberty; if they chanced to lose it, they would become one of the most slavish peoples of the earth."—*Esprit des Lois*, Liv. ii. chap. iv.

The Reformation, which extinguished the relations of several states with the rest of Christendom, and introduced distrust and divisions into the whole community, the decline of feudalism, and other minor causes, determined the existence of this admirable Commonwealth. It had performed its mission, however, and it were the height of folly to desire its restoration. But the effect of the abolition was speedily felt in those countries, which, by reason of their original adoption of the civil code, or of their more complete subjection to the worst passages in the feudal law, were behind our own country and some few others, in the career of progress. Henceforward, their chains were riveted, apparently for ever. But in England, which had so long enjoyed the proud privilege of a parliament, of the chartered peace of municipalities, and the subjects' dearest birth-right, of trial by jury, the consequences were most remarkable. The coerced people were not long in discovering that their chief security had hitherto been the restraint from without the realm, which had hitherto kept the sovereign from any open violation

of their liberties,—and that not the parliaments, nor the corporations,—nor even trial by jury,—had had so great a share in their well-being as they had at first conceived. For not only were the recognized laws of the realm notoriously violated by the Tudor, who gave to his proclamations the force of acts of parliament, but also the parliament itself, so far from restraining him in his career, became the best and most willing instrument of his desires. Even the favourable verdicts of venal or affrighted juries did not suffice to the rapid persecutions of the crown, and the ingenuity of judges was resorted to, for the purpose of turning the high court of parliament itself into another Star-Chamber. Lord Coke tells the story in the true language of loyalism:—

“I had it of Sir Thomas Gawdgc, Knight, a grave and reverend judge of the King's Bench, who lived at that time, that King Henry the Eighth commanded him to attend the chiefe justices, and to know whether a man that was forthcoming might be attainted of high treason by parliament, and never called to his answer. The judges answered, that it was a dangerous question, and that the high court of parliament ought to give examples to inferiour courts for proceeding according to justice, and no inferiour court could do the like; and they thought that the high court of parliament would never do it. But being by the expresse commandement of the King, and pressed by the said Earle to give a direct answer, they said, that if he be attainted by parliament, it could not come in question afterwards, whether he were called or not called to answer. And albeit their opinion was according to law, yet might they have made a better answer; for, by the statutes of Mag. Cart. ca. 29. 5. E. 3. cap. 9. and 28. E. 3. cap. 5, no man ought to be condemned without answer, &c. which they might have certified, but, *facta tenent multa, quæ fieri prohibentur*, the act of attainder being passed by Parliament, did bind, as they resolved. The party against whom this was intended, was never called in question, but the first man after the said resolution, that was so attainted, and never called to answer, was the said Earl of Essex.”—4 *Instit.* 37.

The divine right of rulers, which, rightly understood, had been, in happier times, the strongest security against the invasion of private rights, now was handled by the pulpit-partisans of the Stuart dynasty into an argument of non-resistance. So extensive had the prerogative become, that during those ages of the Reformation, the sin of Popery was enacted against in parliament, and punished in the courts, not as heresy against God, but as high treason to the sovereign! So complete had been the revolution in thought, word, and deed, among the reigning authorities! The courtier-leaders of the new faith, found it their interest to keep pace with the retrograde movement,—and hence the spaniel-like meanness of Bacon himself,

who was by no means singular in the intenseness of his worship, for he was the contemporary of Coke, among the rest, of whom even James the First had declared, "that he was the fittest instrument for a tyrant that had ever been known in England." Not only in speech, but much more in action, Euphuism was at court the established order of the day. But the people were not so easily reconciled to the change. The sudden cessation of the ancient check to arbitrary power, had plunged England into a deeper gulph of despotism than she had ever known before. It was for the people to create another in its place, out of the means which were still in their own hands. The imbecility of James favoured the commencement of the enterprise, and under the reign of his son, the English liberties were at last consolidated,—but the reaction was fearful,—and the price paid for the boon was the extinction of the monarchy—and the Iron Mask at Whitehall!

If St. Thomas of Canterbury had defended the rights of the English Church against the populace, and not against the crown, he would have won and retained the sympathies and love of even the Anglican clergy of modern times. As it was, however, one of the first acts of the Reformation was to cite the saint, in impious mockery of forms of justice, to appear in thirty days before the council, and there to answer to a charge of high treason. On the 2d of June 1538,* by a decree of the king in council, St. Thomas was declared "guilty of the crime of leze-majesté, treason, perjury, and rebellion." The hatred which his firmness against the regal prerogative excited in the breast of every man who preached the freedom of conscience, as understood by the makers of the Reformation, affords several other instances equally characteristic. We have at this moment open before us the famous Parisian edition of the *Horæ Beatissimæ Virginis Mariæ*, published in the year 1526, with the rubric in English. On the fly-leaf of our copy, is the autograph of White Kennett, the famous Protestant bishop of Peterborough, who seems to have cherished in secret a formula of prayer which the homilies pronounced idolatrous, and the possession of which had been made illegal by act of parliament. But the castigating hand of the bishop had been busy on the book, and the passages which he has obliterated belong to one of three classes,—1st, all sentences in which indulgences are named; 2d, all words expressing the title of Pope; or 3dly, all passages which relate to

* Both the citation and the decree are to be met with in Wilkins' *Concilia*, vol. iii. 836.

the martyrdom of St. Thomas of Canterbury.* In the last class, the episcopal virulence is perhaps more alive than in either of the former. It would be worth the while to ascertain whether that orthodox prelate considered, that in performing this duty of correction, he had succeeded in removing *every* taint of heterodoxy from the book.

But whatever the opinion of Protestant prelates upon this subject is, or may have been, it is cheering to know, that even in these days, the bright examples of the Church of our fathers are not lost upon the lover of British freedom, any more than upon the practices of Christian duties. If we cling to the ancient faith of England with undying adherence, upon the one hand, we preserve the love of justice and hatred of oppression, which were warm within our fathers' hearts, upon the other.

"And if," as Mr. Ozanam eloquently expresses it, "in this famous isle, whole generations have kept themselves immovable in the faith of their ancestors: if, after three hundred years of persecutions and reproaches, Catholicism has raised her brow, and now extends herself with a marvellous force, that makes Reformation to tremble even in her golden palaces; if Ireland has broken her bands by one sublime effort,—if a wondrous man has arisen from the midst of his Catholic brethren, and has, in their name, protested against the satraps of heresy; it is, perhaps, because, among those faithful generations, in that Ireland, and upon that man, hovers the great soul of St. Thomas of Canterbury. God forbid that I compare a mortal man, and one that is not yet judged, with him whose memory has received a solemn consecration! But him also, the unconquerable Archbishop, his enemies called the Great Agitator!"

And to these heroes of the middle age, those who walk not with us, have reason to be grateful too. For if our England had succumbed to Henry II, in the person of her Church, four centuries before the light of knowledge appeared in the brightness of noon-day,—if the temporal power, so material and barbarous, had at that time absorbed the spiritual power, as has long been the case in the Russian empire,—the whole kingdom, shut out from all intercourse with the faithful nations around them, "save on the field of battle," must assuredly "have descended to a degree of brutishness comparable to the state of Russia, from the day when she became schismatic down to the

* There is in the library of St. Edmund's College, in Hertfordshire, a Missal, in which the Mass for St. Thomas of Canterbury has been erased. The word Pope has also been made to disappear throughout the whole volume. This missal was, it would seem, intended to be, like the "*Philologia Sacra*" of Glassius, "*nostris temporibus accommodata*."

days of Peter the Great." If, too, the destruction of feudalism, and the formation of modern society upon its ruins, be justly regarded as two great benefits to the European race, then all Europe must applaud the generous devotion of the Church, which inspired her to stand forth, resist, and overcome, as often as the feebleness of the sovereign, the lowliness of the commons, and the sense of its own iron strength, tempted feudality forth from its just bounds, and invited it to undertake its frequent invasions upon the entirety of society. An union with the Church, its only potent adversary, must have crushed all opposition, doubled the intensity of its power, and prolonged for many ages the era of its reign. Perhaps it is not too much to suppose, that even in our days we might still have had to look forward to the closing scene of its existence.

We now take our leave of the book before us, with our thanks to its author for his services to our national cause, and the sanguine assurance, that it will soon become the welcome guest of many an English circle.

ART. III.—1. *Geschichte der Vorläufer der Reformation. History of the Forerunners of the Reformation.* By Dr. Ludwig Flathe. Leipzig. 1835.

2. *Histoire des Vaudois des Vallées du Piémont.* Par A. Muston. Paris. 1834.

3. *Considérations sur les Vaudois.* Par M. Peyran.

4. *Recherches Historiques sur la véritable Origine des Vaudois, et sur le Caractère de leurs Doctrines Primitives.* Paris. 1836.

AMONG the credentials of a new sect, it is important that a good pedigree should find its place. With a true religion there is no difficulty in satisfying this necessity, or, rather, the religion is a genealogy unto itself. But if, unhappily, the falsehood of the doctrine should render it desirable to resort to some "ingenious device" of the coiner's art, and to gild the naked dross in the glitter of a fiction, there is, at the outset, to be overcome the jealous vigilance of all contemporary observers, and then for an eternal future, to be feared the hazard of detection and exposure. Now these are all very serious things, and not so easily to be guarded against, as easily to be foreseen. The consequence, however, is one very fatal to the sanguinely-conceived and cunningly-devised forthcomings of the ambitious brains of our religionist,—they want the sanction of age,—

they tell too plainly of notions and motions, human, every-day, common-place,—not a man who reviews them but can put his finger upon every article of them, and say, “This came or might have come in my own generation.”

Our Anglican fellow-countrymen seem, at last, to fear that they are thus awkwardly situated. We have drawn attention more than once, and especially in our last number, to the evidence which has of late years been repeatedly afforded us by the High Church section of their body, of an irresistible conviction upon their parts, that notwithstanding the great rejoicings which welcomed the dawning of the morn of the English Tercentenary,—a period, after all, of only three centuries,—is not in fact such an existence as gives to that or any Church professing to be Christian, a very great subject of exultation, and that in the nineteenth century of the Christian era, that Church must, at the best, be deemed but ill-provided with a title to her followers’ allegiance, which contents herself with tracing out a descent more or less unbroken from some sectary of the sixteenth century. We took occasion, however, to demonstrate how utterly groundless and inconsequential were the pretensions put forth by these discontented upholders of free inquiry to any more illustrious descent, or to any portion of the traditions of the primitive Church, or of their divine jurisdiction and apostolical succession. The attempt, however, to make these pretensions good, had been already of frequent occurrence, but of an uniform ill-success. It has been one of the means employed at various periods in the history of Anglicanism, by such of her sons as believed it important to establish a communion with the Church of the apostolic age.

It was only one of those means; and it is our intention in the present paper to indicate another method which is sometimes employed for the same end, but of a character altogether different. We allude to the endeavours of certain writers to affiliate the Protestants to the Waldenses, and these again to SS. Paul and James, thus tracing the stream of the Reformation to within the sacred enclosure of the apostolic college itself. An easy, clear, and natural conclusion,—only supposing the premises to have been sufficiently founded upon fact! This important condition, however, has as yet been complied with, neither on the part of the Waldenses themselves, nor on that of their would-be descendants,—and we trust that we shall make good this assertion in the present article, so as to satisfy the judgment of every sensible and candid reader.

Who were the Vaudois or Waldenses? What was their era? What were their doctrines? And in what relation do they

stand to the Vaudois of the present day? These are the questions which naturally present themselves to the mind, on the answers to which rests the whole controversy before us. And they must be resolved by an appeal to facts and documents, without whose testimony on the points all history becomes romance, all conclusions, speculation. It may here be proper at once to observe, that the Vaudois writers, as well modern as ancient (we speak of course relatively), although much divided against each other, and even contradicting themselves, as we shall hereafter show, with respect to the real antiquity of their Alpine sect, are nevertheless agreed in giving the most unqualified contradiction to the testimony which Catholic and other writers of credibility have at all times rendered to their descent from an obscure fanatic of the latter end of the twelfth century, Peter Valdo, the merchant of Lyons. They renounce him for their founder,—for, being Alpines, how can they brook aught but an Alpine extraction? and claiming him for their descendant, they disclaim him for the author of their name, affecting, in their passion for antiquity, to discover in their own valleys, under their Latin or French designations, an etymology everlasting as the hills which tower around them. The question, therefore, having assumed the character of so tangible an issue, we proceed, at once, to the investigation, not being desirous on the one hand that Valdo should be thus ungratefully deprived of his rights of paternity, nor on the other hand, that the preceding annals of the Church should be intruded on by a heresy, which, in fact, never belonged to them. We are greatly indebted to the intelligent and learned author of the *Recherches Historiques*, a Piedmontese bishop, for the long and numerous citations upon this and many other heads which he has given us in his valuable work, the fruit of severe and laborious research, and of which we intend to avail ourselves largely upon the present occasion.

We shall begin with the Catholic view of the subject; and this, not only because we of all others have the right to do so, but because that view is, as usual, the oldest in the field, and here, as everywhere else, we find our adversaries reduced to *deny* our statements and *protest* against our proofs. But the evidence which they would repudiate is that of all the contemporary writers of their founder, Valdo, who are of one consent in establishing his fame as a new heresiarch, following practices, and preaching doctrines wholly distinct indeed from those of the Church, but equally independent in their origin of all the heretical or schismatic sects that had appeared since the days of the apostles down to their own times. To understand more

perfectly the details of this new division in Christendom, it is necessary to take a short review of the state of ecclesiastical affairs during the twelfth century, the period of its occurrence. The phenomena, which the annals of that age present to our contemplation, are of the most startling kind. It was of all others the age of new opinions in matters of faith and morals, bearing relation each to the other in no single respect, save in the monstrous extravagance of their conception, and in their fearful consequences, memorials of one common extraction. According to Michelet, the Rationalist historian of France, (vol. III. c. vi.) "it was as in the secular days of the great week of creation. Nature, assaying herself, cast forth at first strange, gigantic, ephemeral productions,—monstrous abortions,—whose remains inspire with horror." The unaccountable exuberance which then displayed itself in the moral and religious world, would well justify the assertion that "the errors to be found there are of such a number and such a nature, that the preachers of the time only left to the innovators and reformers who were to come the embarrassment of selection."* Unhappily, too, the evil did not end there. The exterior world was doomed to receive its visitations also at the hands of the heretics whenever the latter thought fit to draw the proper conclusion from the maxims they had learned. In the name of the Bible (for with the reservation of Abeillard, not one of these restless spirits built up his system on the base of Rationalism), the churches were pillaged and profaned, the crosses burned, ecclesiastical property invaded, and the clergy insulted, on every side. The new glosses thrown by these sectarian teachers on the ethics of Scripture, tended to fill Europe with those hordes of Condottieri and other brigands, who were without faith as without a country, and brought, in a word, such general woes upon Christendom, that even M. Michelet confesses that there was left no other pledge of order than *Christianity*, and that *the safety of Christianity was certainly in the unity of the Church*.† The mission, however, of these ebullitions was hitherto one of destruction only. The human mind was yet too young in the service of heresy to converge itself and its opportunities upon any great plan for the ages which lay before it. It was reserved for the sixteenth century at once to destroy the past, and upon the ruins of its grandeur to raise up its own scheme of mischief for the times to come.

On the other hand, the Church, profoundly impressed with the gravity of the evil, opposed to it all the means of which she found herself in possession, and even called forth new resources

* *Recherches Hist.* p. 386.

† Michelet, *Hist. de France*, t. iii. c. vii.

of a character peculiarly adapted to the age. We have treated of its splendid prerogatives in another paper; suffice it here to observe, that before the end of the century, the reaction had become complete.

In some instances, indeed, the zeal of the religiously disposed outran discretion. This was to so unhappy a degree the case of Peter Valdo, that in spite of the innocence, or rather the praiseworthiness, of his first steps in the reform of manners and renovation of Christian spirit, he soon fell away into disobedience and schism, and finally into the heresy which survived himself. Upon this point, all his contemporaries are quite agreed, and they fix the commencement of his heresy at the year 1180 or thereabouts. These contemporaries are Bernard, Abbot of Foncald, who lived at the end of the twelfth century; Alan de l'Isle, the Universal Doctor, who died at the commencement of the thirteenth century; Eberard de Bethune, and Peter de Vaucernay, also writers of the same period; Stephen de Belleville, a Dominican and Inquisitor at that time; Moneta, a Dominican, at the beginning of the thirteenth century; Conrad, Abbot of Ursperg, whose book against the Vaudois bears the date of 1212; Rainier Sacco, the contemporary and colleague of Moneta, who having been seventeen years a priest and bishop of the Cathari, allies of the Vaudois, afterwards renounced his errors, and during the rest of his days presided in Lombardy as an inquisitor over the followers of these two heresies; Peter of Polichdorf, a writer of the middle of the same century,—an anonymous writer (supposed to be Ivonet), whose treatise is preserved in the fifth volume of D. Martené's *Thesaurus Novus Anecdotorum*, p. 1778, and is believed to have been as ancient as the end of the thirteenth century,—and other writers, the contemporaries of all these, and agreeing in the same recital. As it would be useless to our purpose, and fatiguing to the reader, to quote each and all of this overwhelming array of testimonies, we shall content ourselves with that of Stephen of Belleville, as being more detailed and explanatory than some of the others, on the circumstances which gave rise to the sect; and the rather so because the curious reader may find, if he pleases, all the other authorities, as well as this one, collected in the original language of the writers, among the *Pièces Justificatives* at the end of the *Recherches Historiques*.

“Now the Waldenses were so styled from the first author of this heresy, who was named Waldensis.* They are also styled Poor Men

* A word of the same etymology as Valdo; and either manner of being spelt, supposed to have been a local name derived from the city of Valdès in Flanders, or, more probably, from the village of Vaud, near Lyons.

of Lyons, for there they began the profession of poverty. But they call themselves Poor of Spirit, because of what the Lord saith, Matt. v., 'Blessed are the poor in spirit;' and truly poor in spirit are they, for they want the spiritual gifts of the Holy Spirit.

"Now that sect began in this manner, according to what I have heard from many who have seen their first members, and from a priest who was much honoured, and a rich man in the city of Lyons, and a friend of our brethren, who was called Bernard Ydros; who, when he was a young man and a copyist, copied for the same Waldenses, for money, the first books they ever had in the Roman language (that is, the French), a certain grammarian translating and dictating to him, named Stephen de Ansa (in the Cod. Rothomag. de Emsâ), whom I have often seen, who, being afterwards preferred to a benefice in the greater church at Lyons, being promoted to the priesthood, falling from the battlements of a house which he was building, ended his days by a sudden death.

"A certain rich man, in the said city, named Waldensis, hearing the Gospels, since he was not very learned, being curious to understand what they said, made an agreement with the said priests; with the one that he should translate them to him in the vulgar tongue; with the other, that he should write down what the first should dictate; which they did: likewise many books of the Bible, and maxims of saints arranged according to heads, which they called Opinions; which when the said citizen often read and got by heart, he proposed to follow evangelical perfection as the Apostles had done. Who, having sold all his goods, in contempt of the world, cast away the money produced by them to the poor, and usurped and presumed upon the office of the Apostles, by preaching the gospels, and those things which he committed to memory, in the ways and streets, and by gathering unto him many men and women to do the same, committing unto them the Gospels. These also, of every base degree, he sent through the neighbouring towns, and penetrating into houses and preaching in the streets, and even in churches, incited others to do the same. But when out of their rashness and ignorance they had every where spread abroad many errors and scandals, being summoned before the Archbishop of Lyons, who was called John, he forbade them to intrude in the expounding or preaching of scripture. But they referring to the reply of the Apostles, in Acts, chap. v., their master usurping Peter's office, even as he answered the chief priests, said, 'It is right to obey God more than men,' who commanded the Apostles, 'Preach the Gospel to every creature,'—at the end of Mark. As though the Lord should have said to them the things he spake to the Apostles, who yet presumed not to preach until they became endued with might from on high, and received the gift of all tongues. They therefore, Waldensis to wit and his people, first out of presumption and usurpation of the apostolic office, fell into disobedience, then into contumacy, then into the sentence of excommunication. Afterwards, driven out of that land, being summoned to the council which was before that of Lateran, (the fourth it seems*) and

* The remark of Echard, the editor.

being pertinacious, they were finally adjudged schismatics. Then in the land of Provence and Lombardy mingling with other heretics and imbibing and adopting their errors, they were adjudged heretics, most hateful and most perilous to the Church, rambling every where, displaying the seeming of holiness and faith, but holding not its truth, so much the more dangerous as they were the more concealed and disguised with all sorts of dresses and artifices. Once a certain leader amongst them was taken, who carried about him the tokens of many contrivances, whereby he transfigured himself like a Proteus. If he were sought for in one character, and it were known to him, he changed instantly into another. Sometimes he wore the dress and symbols of a pilgrim, sometimes the staff and irons of a penitent, sometimes he feigned himself a cobbler, sometimes a barber, sometimes a reaper, &c. Likewise so do the others. Now this sect began about the year 1170, (in the Cod. Rothom. 1180,) under John, surnamed Bolesmanis, Archbishop of Lyons.*

William of Puylaureus, the historian of the war against the Albigenses, one of the sects of this period, and himself a contemporary of Valdo, enables us to ascertain with sufficient precision, who were the heretics of Lombardy and Provence, to whom the disciples of the Lyons merchant united themselves, according to the preceding citation, after their precipitate departure from the place of their nativity. Speaking of the fearful ravages which these miscreants, whom it suits the morality of the Anglican Church, high and low, to vindicate and applaud, committed in the fairest and richest quarters of Europe, he tells us that in these hordes of bandits, "There were some who were Arians, others Manicheans,† others again *Valdenses* or *Lyonnese*, who although among themselves disagreeing, did nevertheless all conspire, for the loss of souls, against the Catholic faith; and yet those *Valdenses* did dispute most sharply against the others. Whence, even in hatred to them, the others were received into communion by ignorant priests. Wherefore the earth, as though reprobate and well nigh accursed, brought little forth but thistles and thorns, robbers and plunderers, thieves, man-slayers, adulterers and open usurers."‡ But we shall return to the question of their connexion with other heretics, when we come to the consideration of their doctrines. The name Vaudois or Waldenses, was not the only one borne by the sect: we have already mentioned that of Poor Men of Lyons. They were known also by the names of Leonists, from the city of their origin, and Sabbatati or Insabbatati, from their superstitious practice of wearing

* Recherches Histor. p. 455.

† These were the Albigenses proper.

‡ See this passage in the "Pièces Justificatives," Rech. Hist. p. 473.

a singular kind of sandal, which they imagined to have been apostolic.* These names are employed without discrimination by all the writers who make any mention of Valdo or his disciples, but in other respects there is a uniformity of statement and even of language in all the numerous narrations of the sect which have descended to us, such as is rarely met with except as a tolerably sure indication of veracity. In a word, the contemporaries of the early disciples of Valdo are agreed in treating them as a new sect, deriving their name of Vaudois from their founder, and seeking countenance and alliance among the other sectaries of the period. Not a single Vaudois writer on the other hand has come down to us from that age to prove the so much desired antiquity of his descent, but actually we have in its place an express defiance from the exact Moneta, which at that day was wholly unanswered, and although in our times accepted by the more adventurous sons of the ancient Vaudois, has resulted only in the defeat and disgrace of their ridiculous pretensions. "If the Vaudois say," thus he writes,† "that they are anterior to Valdo, let them prove it by some evidence; which they are in utter impossibility of doing."

Nor is this all. There is, happily for the cause of truth, still extant, in the *Liber Statutorum Civitatis Pinarolii*, the first historic document which notices the appearance, then quite recent, of the Vaudois in their village of the Alps. It will be seen that the citizens of Pignerol, certainly the most competent to say who were and who were not their countrymen, did notwithstanding regard these same Vaudois as foreigners who had newly come into Piedmont. "Also it is enacted, that if any man or woman shall give hospitality to any Vaudois man or woman, knowingly, in the territory of Pignerol, he or she shall pay a fine of ten soldi, as often as such hospitality is given."‡ The date of this bye-law is 1220, a date sufficiently near to the epoch of Valdo's defection, to explain the reason why, for the first time, any mention of the Vaudois should have then been made on a historical record, while, at the same time, it becomes apparent that that term was not understood in any local or territorial signification, and that it represented a class of persons forming a ludicrously small minority among the people, and evidently strangers in the land which imposed such heavy penalties on their entertainment.§ The Vaudois themselves have not always been averse to recognise so plain a truth. In

* Eberard de Bethune's *Liber Anti-Hæresis*, cap. xxv. ap.; Bibl. PP. t. xxiv. p. 1572; Rech. Hist. p. 146.

† Rech. Hist. p. 52.

‡ Ibid. p. 490.

§ Ten soldi were equivalent to nearly 300 livres of the present day.

1585, they presented a petition to Charles Emmanuel the First, in which they content themselves with claiming an antiquity for their religion "*of some hundreds of years*" only.* In 1599, they addressed a letter to Lesdiguières, praying his good offices with Emmanuel Philibert, and setting forth that "it is not since fifty years alone that the Vaudois people has had the knowledge of the pure truth, but even from *five to six hundred years*, of which his Excellency cannot be ignorant."† In 1573, they had already presented a petition to the Comte de Birague, Lieutenant of the King of France, on their side of the Alps, couched in these terms: "The Vaudois intreat his Excellency to make it known to the King that it is more than four hundred and fifty years that their people, from father to son, even down to themselves, have made profession of this religion," &c.‡ We shall simply add to the store of evidences and proofs which sparkle in every page of the book before us, that in the hilly country which surrounds Lyons, the country of Peter Valdo, we ourselves have heard the Protestants of those parts spoken of by their fellow-countrymen, under the name of Vaudois. A striking confirmation this of the etymology advanced by Catholic writers.

But if these writers be credible and their story a true one, what becomes of Vaudois antiquity, the most interesting monument of the history of Christianity?§ What becomes of M. Muston's eloquence and extasy on the subject of "this little people, forgotten, poor, weak according to the world, but full of a faith powerful and victorious, which has traversed ages, revolutions of empires, and all the wrecks of the earth || this people apart and so remarkable, which holds historically to the cradle of Christendom, &c. &c. &c.?"¶ Are these magnificent titles and privileges to be abandoned by those Esaus, their possessors, without even the poor price of Edom's pottage in exchange? The three first books which head our article forbid the base suspicion, and call upon us to investigate the other side of the controversy. And here, doubtless, we are going to be favoured with every sort of document from the historical to the romantic, from the polemical to the philosophical, from prose to poetry, culled here and there from the richness of those pages in their annals, "which," as M. Muston, their historian, avers, "no poem can equal; than which never

* Rech. Hist. p. 267.

† Ibid. p. 268.

‡ Ibid. p. 269.

§ Brez's Hist. des Vaud. &c. p. 12, 13.

|| "Who knows," asks the author of the *Recherches Historiques*, (p. 8,) "if, after M. Muston, the Vaudois will not turn out to have been an antediluvian people?"

¶ Hist. des Vaud. liv. i. p. 8; liv. ii. p. 92.

Walter Scott or Byron, never a Homer has conceived scenes more sublime;" nor ought this to startle our belief, for they are the annals of a people whose very valleys are stored with "rocks which are poems, and whose history, when most naked of incident, is a temple which men nor time cannot destroy!"* The list, however, of authorities, is strangely scanty for a people so well provided with literature. Of the existence of writers living about the different times, which they are pleased to assign to their sect for the epochs of its origin, they do not even profess to have heard, and the first books of recognised dates which they cite upon their side, are, strange to say, those of Rainier and Polichdorf, and other Catholic writers of various dates, which are commonly produced as in the present article, to prove their descent from a rich merchant of Lyons! To these we must add two undated or misdated documents, a *Treatise on Antichrist* and the *Nobla Leïzon*, both in manuscript, for which they claim an anteriority, that we shall presently notice, of only fifty years for the one and seventy years for the other, over Peter Valdo! But then they are strong in assertion, powerful in traditions unvouched, in possibilities and likelihoods, dexterous in wresting "line upon line,—here a little, there a little,"—from the pages of succeeding Catholic writers,—to their own purposes; and above all, marvellously fortified in the possession of certain rules of criticism so peculiarly their own, that none but a Vaudois would ever think of challenging them for himself. Then again they rival Mrs. Malaprop herself "in retrospection of the future," and appeal for aid whenever they find themselves at fault to the Protestant writers of the last three centuries, who, upon their side, nothing loth thereat, "anticipate the past," and supply their protégés with as much evidence as they choose to call for. No wonder that a friendly reviewer, great in the service of Anglicanism, and deeply sympathising with the Waldenses, should have found that the works assertive of their venerable antiquity,† served to excite rather than satisfy curiosity."

Id verius quod prius. So thought the Vaudois, so think the Protestants, and hence the absurd and incoherent story which their writers rave of, who would link the latter to the former, and these to the Apostles. Even if they had succeeded they would have been in no better plight than Simon Magus and his followers formerly were, since antiquity and apostolicity mean two things in tradition and succession too, widely different from each other. Then again, while the possession of Vaudois

* Liv. i. p. 37-40; pref. p. vi.

† British Critic, vol. i. p. 379.

allegiance offered a passage into Italy for reformation enterprise, and assured its leaders, too, of four centuries of antiquity at least, even though they should fail in the more important aspiration,—the Vaudois, who, at that time, had nearly verged upon the annihilation which ever attends on heresy, saw the immense advantage accruing from a junction with Swiss cantons and German princes, whose arms might serve them in time of need. But as this union of parties required something more than the evident policy of the arrangement to make it palatable to the world, the zeal and skill of either were taxed to the uttermost how to supply the ominous silence of history in their regard, and to encounter without defeat her testimony against them. Leaving the natural inference to the reader, we proceed to examine the account which the modern Waldenses give of themselves. “Why should I wish to refute again this ridiculous idea,” demands M. Muston of himself indignantly, “that in the deep bosom of these mountains, where they existed before him, our Vaudois have owed their origin to the *Reformer on the Banks of the Rhône?*” “Poor Valdo!” says the witty author of the *Recherches Historiques*, (p. 83,) “well may’st thou say with some others, *filios enutrivisti et educavi, et ipsi spreverunt me!*” “We possess,” says M. Peyran,* “many authentic manuscripts which contain the doctrine of the Vaudois, and which are all anterior to Valdo; in the one which is dated 1120,† (*Treatise of Antichrist*,) we read the causes of the separation of the Vaudois from the Roman Church; Valdo, then, who lived fifty years later, is not the author of this separation; in another dated in 1100, (*La Noblu Lëizon*,) we find the word Vaudois employed as synonymous with ‘virtuous Christian;’ it is not then from Valdo, who lived seventy years later, that the Vaudois have received their name; they must have borne it even before the twelfth century, since, already at that epoch, they were known and decried under that name, as men who led a life different from that of other Christians.” In this judgment his worthy colleagues perfectly concur. And yet, with respect to the *Treatise of Antichrist*, we find M. Muston, after having been reduced to reject the *Spiritual Almanack*, and *A Confession of Faith of 1120*, as spurious documents, expressing himself thus wisely in reference to this one also:—“As to the book on Antichrist it offers many features of the manners of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, but, it must be confessed, we have not of its authenticity either proofs

* Peyran, p. 27-8.

† Léger gives sometimes this date and sometimes 1126, pp. 71, 83.

quite incontestable." * In fact, the authorship of this precious document has been abandoned by Perrin, the Vaudois historian, to Pierre de Bruis, the founder of the sect of Petrobrusians; while the author of the *Recherches Historiques*, upon collating it with the books which contain the doctrines of the Cathari, pronounces it to have been written by one of that body of heretics. At all events, it contains not a single characteristic doctrine of the Vaudois, and has even excited the bile of M. Muston, who observes that a passage of the book, "where that verse, fundamental for the Roman Church, *Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my church*, is taken in the same sense which Catholics give to it, that is to say, that they interpret it as if St. Peter had indeed received from Jesus Christ a marked superiority over the other Apostles." † Be that as it may, the book, whether written by Vaudois or Cathar, or disciple of Bruis, bears on its face its self-conviction as to date, in citation of the work called *Milleloquium*, which it attributes to St. Augustin, and which unluckily is only a compilation from the works of that Father, ‡ made between 1243 and 1328, the respective periods of the birth and death of the compiler, Augustinus Triumphus. Alas for the *Treatise of Antichrist*!

Come we now to poetry. The *Nobla Lëizon*, we learn in the pages of M. Bert, is a manuscript poem containing the doctrine of the Vaudois, whom it styles by that name (Vaudès) sixty years before Valdo appeared. § M. Peyran has already told us that it bears the precise date of the year 1100. Notwithstanding that the character in which this poem is written, and of which a very neatly executed fac-simile has been given in the *Recherches Historiques*, (p. 255,) is pronounced by palæographers of learning, to belong to the thirteenth, or at the very earliest, to the twelfth century, we are bound to pay all due credit to the expressed date, if any there be, until we light upon such an unhappy anachronism as that which appears in the *Treatise of Antichrist*. But, in fact, no date at all is to be found there! Those who assert that there is, point to the two lines in the body of the work,

" Ben ha mil e cent anes compli entierament
Que fo scripta lora car seu al dernier temp,"

and insist upon it that they are equal to the same thing. But they are not so. The writer, alluding to a notion which formerly was rife among Christians, that the end of the world was

* Muston, p. 134.

† Ibid. p. 106.

‡ See Cave's Scriptor. Eccl. Hist. Litter.

§ Le Liv. de Fam. p. 19-20.

to happen at the end of the year 1000 of the Christian era, and warning them that it had only been delayed, begins thus: "There are quite 1100 years entirely complete since it was written that we are at the latter times." Did he mean that there was not a fraction more than 1100 years passed, or would he not have said precisely the same, notwithstanding the number of years short of a century, elapsed since the *complete* period of 1100 years, just as we at this day talk of the eighteen centuries that have passed since the birth of Christ, or the nineteenth century, which now is, taking no thought of the fraction of thirty-seven years which follow the one, or of the sixty-three years which remain to complete the other? Then again does the writer say that the "1100 years entirely complete" were computed from the Christian era? Does he not on the contrary altogether exclude this interpretation, by expressly limiting them to commence from the time when the prophecy was supposed to have been written,—in other words, from the date of the Apocalypse? Our own countryman, Mr. Hallam, certainly not particularly inclined to do justice to Catholic historians and chroniclers, when confronted with those of our enemies, has already examined this pretension and rejected it as unfounded.* So have Fuesselin and Gieseler (writers of great credit with M. Muston†), and so has Shroëckh. Mr. Lowther believes it to have been the work of one of the Cathari; be it so. In that case, there is more reason for his Vaudois to blush than to plume themselves on the praises bestowed by its author on their fathers' morality. And thus much for the only ancient documents which these primitive people can produce in support of their high antiquity, the groundwork of M. Muston's argument, "the proof which enables him to dispense with all other arguments, and its date, whereof if any man shall doubt, there will be nothing upon which henceforth with a little good will, men may not doubt here below."‡

But Rainier Sacco, it seems, is to relieve them from their embarrassment. In the *Liber contra Valdenses*,§ after speaking of the Manicheans and other sects, he says, "Among all those sects which exist yet, or are already extinct, there has been none more fatal for the Church than that of the Leonists, and this for three reasons. *The first is that it is the one which reckons back the longest duration; for some say that it dates from the time of S. Sylvester; others from the time of the Apostles.* The second reason is that it is more widely spread,

* Europe in the Middle Ages, t. iv. p. 271, 2nd note.

† Liv. ii. p. 137-141, (notes.)

‡ Pp. 136, 138, 140.

§ Reinerii Cont. Vald. lib. cap. iv. in Bibl. PP. t. xxv.

there being scarcely a country where it is not found.* The third, lastly, is that while the other sects inspire those who hear them with horror, by the grossness of their blasphemies against God, this one, on the contrary, displays a great appearance of piety," &c., &c. . . . "Note that the sect of *Poor Men of Lyons*, who are also called *Leonists*, arose in this wise. While the richer citizens of Lyons were together, it chanced that a certain one of them died suddenly in their presence. Whereat one among them was so terrified that he immediately devoted a large sum to the poor. And upon this a very great crowd of poor flocked to him, whom he exhorted to hold voluntary poverty, and to be imitators of Christ and the Apostles. But as he was somewhat lettered, he taught them in the vulgar tongue the text of the New Testament, for which rashness when he was reprimanded, he became contemptuous, and began to insist on his doctrine, saying to his disciples, that the clergy, since they were of wicked life, envied their holy life and doctrine (!) But when the Pope launched against them the sentence of excommunication, they pertinaciously despised it, and so even till this day in all our borders do they increase their doctrine and rancour against us. Note three things; first concerning the blasphemies wherewith they blasphemous the Roman Church and its statutes and all its clergy. In the second place are handled their errors about ecclesiastical sacraments and the saints. In the third place, note all the curses with which they curse all the honest and approved customs of the Church. In the first place, they say *that the Roman Church is not the Church of Jesus Christ, but the Church of malignants; and that it fell away under Sylvester*, when the poison of temporalities was infused into the Church, *and they say that they are the Church of Christ*, for they observe *the doctrine of Christ's Gospel and the Apostles in word and deed.*"†

The passage in italics from chap. iv. is that on which the hope of the Vaudois, a most forlorn one it must be confessed,

* What will the Vaudois say to this passage, depriving their mountains of the privilege of having been that land of Gessen which "preserved the Christian rite and doctrine in all evangelic purity and simplicity, while the thickest darkness covered the rest of Europe?"—(Brez. Pref. pp. xii. xiii.) We may, in part, perhaps, deliver them from their dilemma, by hazarding the very probable conjecture that *Leonist*, applied at first *specifically* to the *Vaudois*, became afterwards a *generic* term for all heretics. Just so in latter times, the word Protestant, originally and strictly too, belonging to the Lutheran protesters, became adopted by every mad-brained sectary that followed in the track of disobedience. And yet the Lutherans adhere to the word as their own, for it is no uncommon occurrence to hear an Anglican, for example, talk of Protestants, meaning Episcopalians, as distinguished from the children of Knox.

† Chap. v.

is for the present founded. To those that are familiar with their writings, it will not be a matter of surprise that not a single author of their body, after quoting it in turns, has thought proper to give either of the two passages which we have connected with it, because they follow it and explain its real signification; nay more, that M. Muston is the only one who has ever dropped a hint of the existence of any such opposing authority. But with their aid, no less than by the literal wording of the passage itself, it becomes evident that the antiquity of the sect was asserted by the Leonists themselves, and not by Rainier Sacco, and that on the contrary, after having exposed the true extraction of the sect, he treats the pretension as one of blasphemy against God and his Church. We cannot clearly see, for our part, why M. Muston and his friends should lay such stress upon the verse in question, because the utmost effect which they can ever hope to produce by so much toil and ingenuity, will be the simple neutralization of Rainier's evidence on either side of the debate, a result, however, which they will never succeed in obtaining.

But M. Muston gets over the whole difficulty, he tells us, by contesting altogether the authenticity of the writings of Rainier, those very writings to which he refers the corroboration of his own crude theories, and attributing this collection of traditions to a stranger, most probably! In the next place, he says that the Leonists were not Vaudois, but the disciples of Valdo, and that Rainier was wrong to confound the two. Yet he accepts, in more than the strictness of the letter, the testimony of the *some*, recorded by Rainier, to the antiquity of these Leonists, as being tantamount to a like testimonial in favour of those Vaudois! Moreover, this same M. Muston and all his fraternity are ever the readiest upon all occasions to seize on the identity of meaning between the words *Vaudois* and *Leonist* as peculiarly favourable to the development of one of their fables, which they have erected into a theory which we shall touch upon in the sequel. It is equally inconceivable to us that this band of writers should have judged the occasion one, which even with Mr. M'Ghee, would justify the "ingenious device," by which they have managed to divide Rainier Sacco into two persons,* for the multiplication of testimony, and leaving to the real or Italian Rainier, the authorship of that one of his two works which we have just cited, attribute to the shadowy or German Reinerus that of his other work the *Summa*. For in that work the favourite passage on which they love to gloze,

* For an account of the exposure of this curious imposture, see the Rech. Hist. p. 177.

appears not, nor any passage approaching to it in terms or in the interpretation which they give it; while on the other hand, Rainier is here more precise than ever on the identity of the Leonists with the Vaudois, or Poor Men of Lyons. Take for instance the following:

"In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. Whereas the sects of heretics heretofore were many, which have been nearly altogether destroyed, by the grace of Jesus Christ, yet now are found two chief ones, whereof one is called the *Cathari* or *Patarini*, the other *Leonists* or *Poor Men of Lyons*, whose opinions are noted in this present page."*

So that Peyran and his brethren have presumed too much upon the well-understood identity of Rainier and Reinerus, or rather, they have unwittingly assented to our interpretation of the passage in the *Liber contra Valdenses*, in asserting that "the" (imaginary) "German Doctor says absolutely the same things and nearly in the same terms, as the Italian inquisitor of the same name!"

As to Polichdorf and the other Catholic writers, whom the same men falsify and affect to cite, we have not space to follow them through their forgeries and their punishment. But as the former author is the only contemporary of Rainier whom they have dared to quote, we shall simply add that their "venerable" Léger (for no one since his time has been rash enough to name that Catholic historian) here presents us with a counterpart to his own candour and that of his brethren in the case of Rainier above commented on. For Polichdorf, who gives the same account of the Lyonnese origin of the sect, had thus commenced the subject:

"The birth and origin of the Waldensian heretics were thus: although these sons of iniquity may lie before the ignorant, saying that their sect has lasted from the times of Pope Sylvester, to wit, when the Church began to have property; this the heresiarchs repute unlawful," &c.†

The veracious Léger thus *paraphrases* the above contemptuous notice of a falsehood, which the want of ancestry had naturally, even in Polichdorf's days, suggested to the sectaries, when preaching to the ignorant:

"The great doctor, being unable to find the origin of this sect, advances nevertheless, as a belief common even among the Vaudois, that they were at least from the beginning of the sixth century!"‡

But it is painful to linger over this system of fraud, since it

* Summa F. Reinerii de Ordine Fratr. Præd. De Cathar. et Leon. Seu Paup. de Lugdun. Thesaur. Nov. Anec. t. v. pp. 1759-60.

† Petri de Polichdorf Contra hæresim Valdens. Tract. Præf. cap. i. in Bibl. P.P. t. xxv.

‡ Liv. i. c. xxviii.

it is impossible to expose it in detail, without feeling ourselves indignantly impelled to give at every instant the *menti par la gorge*. To sum up succinctly, then, all the *tours d'artifice* of these gentry, who having not an ancient document of their own, and finding no mention of their sect in even Catholic writers earlier than the close of the twelfth century, are reduced to make the most of any loose, strained or misquoted passages, which their watchful perseverance may seem to have extorted from these, we shall spare ourselves the trouble of any farther elucidations of Vaudois dishonesty, by this time pretty well established in the minds of our readers, and present them with the following passage from the Catholic pages of the *Recherches Historiques* :—

“ We have seen that they rely on Rainier to mount back to St. Sylvester, and Rainier replies to them that their pretension is nothing less than a *blasphemy*, and he refers them to *the citizen of Lyons who had given birth to their sect*. They run to Æneas Sylvius (Pius II) and this pope, who knew that they had been condemned for nearly 300 years, gives them no other satisfaction than that of making known to them that *they have been a long time condemned*. They run to Seyssel, and Seyssel maintains and proves to them, that they *utter fables* that are not even *probable*, and which cannot impose but on those *who understand nothing in matter of history*. They invoke Cassini, they make him say that they are members of the Christian Church, and that they are as ancient as that Church; and Cassini replies to them that he knows but one Church of Jesus Christ, that it is the Church Catholic and Roman, and that the Vaudois have never belonged to it. They turn themselves to Belvedere, and he answers them but by facts and dates that overthrow irrefragably their pretensions. They address themselves to Roremo, and Roremo, ascending to their origin, places it clearly at the end of the twelfth century, and leaves them only in uncertainty on the date of the later epoch, when they penetrated into the valleys in which they pretend to believe themselves established from the time of the Apostles. Finally, they come to Campion,* to Gretzer and to St. Bernard; now it is enough to glance at the text of these authors, to see, 1st. That Léger has confounded designedly, the epoch of the institution of the order of the Jesuits with that of the Church, to make Campion say that the Vaudois are more ancient than the Catholics, whilst he only says that they are anterior to the Jesuits. 2ndly. That Gretzer treats as an *absurd fable* a certain pretension, which in M. Muston's words, he would not have dared to deny. 3rdly. That St. Bernard, finally, has not written a line, a word against the Vaudois; that these are nowhere named in his works, and that he has refuted different heretics, of whom none belonged to the *sect* of the Vaudois.”†

* The glorious martyr of Elizabeth's reign in England.

† Rech. Hist. p. 236.

We have now done with the muniments of title, printed and manuscript, ancient and modern, forged and genuine, that Vaudois ingenuity has been able to amass, in proof that they hold "the faith once delivered to the saints." Let us now hear the judgment passed upon them by one of the most laborious of these collectors, the often-quoted M. Muston.

"The loss of all the old documents of the Vaudois," he says, "takes from him the means of reproducing their immediate succession from the first centuries, it deprives him of sources direct and positive from which he might have drawn. . . . It will be necessary then to beg of *all the centuries* some *superficial* testimonies escaped here and there from their annals, and *it will not be without difficulty* if he shall succeed in drawing forth some rays of truth *Many among these citations have not a great authority*, but they have been destined in this case to make known the style and the opinions of their authors. . . ."

He confesses that "a necessary uncertainty" reigns in his work; "that the result of his researches will not be absolutely unassailable," and that his opinion, however "demonstrated," will be only "extremely probable," or even a "simple probability."* "When an author judges thus his own opinions, he spares others, at least, the trouble of reproaching him with his inconsistencies and his contradictions: *mentita est iniquitas sibi.*"†

But their arms have not yet failed them. They have etymological and chronological reasons against the paternity of the despised Valdo. The authors who have written his eventful history were not at all agreed about the spelling of this surname; nor is it wonderful, for they were of different nations, and each latinized the dissyllable after his own fashion. Thus we have Valdo, Waldo, Valdio, Valdensis, Valdesius. To these M. Peyran adds Baldo, but as, unluckily there is no authority for this reading, we let it pass, though it might easily come under the same category with the others. Now the mighty argument which these writers draw from this astonishing fact, is, that a man with a name so variously spelt could never have existed at all, at least, as founder of the Vaudois. If so, Heaven preserve the future immortality of our gallant countryman, the Duke, from the annihilating etymology of continental newspapers! Dr. Flathé,‡ whose work we have perused with attention, in the disappointed hope of finding something better than the sweepings of Vaudois printing rooms, hazards a new argument, of much originality doubtless, upon the strength of Peter's surname, against the paternity of the

* Pref. x. and pp. 84, 109, 386.

† Rech. Hist. p. 293.

‡ Vol. i. p. 296.

Waldenses. He tells us that the supposed name of Valdo, if borne at all, must have been a surname; that in the twelfth century there were no surnames, and that consequently the Vaudois could not have derived their name and descent from the Lyonnese merchant. Were there indeed no surnames in those days? St. Francis, commonly called of Assisium, born in the twelfth century, was son of Peter *Bernardone*, and St. Clare, his co-operator in the foundation of his order, had the family surname of Sciffi. What, too, was Sacco, the *postnomen* of Reinerus, not to speak of the local surnames bestowed upon every person of fame for greater distinction? Let the Doctor only run his eye over the list of Catholic writers whom we have produced, and he will find Stephen of Belleville, Alan of l'Isle, Eberard de Bethune, Peter of Vaucernay, &c. But then, says Dr. Flathe, there is no such place in the neighbourhood of Lyons as the town of Walden, whence Peter is said to have taken his name. Few have attempted to ascertain the town which was thought worthy of that honour, but the better opinion is, that Polichdorf, who fixed on Walden, was quite wrong, and that Vaud, a small village near Lyons, was the place. Others name the city of Valdés, in Flanders. But we believe that his manes have not been appeased with the like contention among cities which followed the funeral of the Grecian bard. We would remind the Doctor, too, of the sect of Petrobrusians, contemporaries or predecessors of Peter Valdo, who received their name from their founder, Peter de Bruis. Here is an instance of a Coryphæus giving his Christian name and his surname to the children of his unbelief, and that too of the twelfth century.*

So, too, (M. Peyran *loquitur*,) "the historians by no means agree with regard to Valdo; some say that he appeared in 1160, others in 1170, others in 1175, others again in 1180."† Therefore there never was a Valdo, or being a Valdo, never one who could lay claim to be the founder of the Vaudois. To this argument, repeated and relied on by Muston, we might reply that if it have any force at all, it must go the extent of denying the existence of Waldo at all; which neither Flathe nor any other sensible historian has thought of doing. But, we will content ourselves with observing, after the intelligent author of

* It is ludicrous to hear the Doctor exulting in the exact conformity which the doctrines of the *Nobla Lièzon* bear to those asserted by Vaudois polemics to have been professed by the imaginary Leo in the days of St. Sylvester. One is reminded of the infamous Lord Howard of Escrick, in the witness box on Sydney's trial, professing his amazement at the unity of truth, as instanced in the agreement between the evidence of the last crown witness, and that which he was about to deliver.

† Ap. Rech. Hist. p. 138.

the *Recherches*, that even admitting the variation as charged, an event so historically authenticated as the rise of the Vaudois in Lyons under Peter Valdo, is not to be enfeebled by an uncertainty of even twenty years as to the date of its occurrence, but that, in fact, the greater part of the historians do not pretend to fix the epoch to a precise year, always employing the word *circa*, when they mention it; and that between the most discordant of the other writers in this regard, there is *not* a question of even twenty years. Besides, the rise of the sect was gradual, its beginnings were good, and it was long before it emerged fully from obscurity: it might well, therefore, be difficult to choose the point at which to designate its first passage into the way of heresy.

But we are as fatigued with this desultory trifling as its authors ought to be, and we seek to know their own etymological derivation of the name of their sect. M. Peyran and his fellows, after "the judicious Theodore Beza and Cougnard, advocate to the parliament of Normandy," (!) resolve the difficulty by tracing the word to the Latin, *Vallis*, and the French, *Vaux*; (which latter, by the way, to make it more peculiarly their own, they represent as being a word from the *patois* of their country,) and hence they say, Vaudois in French, Valdensis in Latin, and Valdese in Italian. "This name, which only seemed at first to distinguish the Vaudois from their neighbours, was afterwards employed to denote their religious belief, so that a Vaudois was at the same time a dweller of the valleys, and a Christian who rejected the traditions of Rome."* Now, besides that L  ger in a remarkable passage (liv. i. ch. 11,) admits that this view of the case is possibly not older than the Reformation, and that Mosheim, Basnage, Hallam, and the better informed Protestant historians, treat it as wholly chimerical, and give their support to the claims of Peter Valdo to the sponsorship of the Vaudois, there are two objections to this theory, as the author of the *Recherches* has observed: 1st. That it proves too much, 2ndly, that it rests on false premises. In the first place, if the name Vaudois became the distinction of the sect on the supposed apostacy of the Church of Rome, it follows that the name must have been already known in the fourth century, if we are to take that period for the date of their separation, or in the ninth century, if that be the preferable one. Nay more, the *patois* itself, whence the name is supposed to be taken, must have been already in a state of development at one or other of these early periods. Is this sought to be main-

* Peyran, p. 31.

tained? If not, and no earlier warrant for the term is to be found than in the twelfth century, of what service to the cause of Vaudois antiquity is the etymology of Beza and the advocate to the Norman parliament? But secondly, this etymology is far from being established. The name of Vaudois, so understood, would surely have been in its origin common to all the dwellers in the Alpine valleys. Now of these the actual Vaudois lay claim to no more than the three valleys which they still inhabit. But there are many more such, embedded deeply among the windings and undulations of the Alps, as long cultivated, as well peopled, and possessing a patois very nearly akin to that of the Vaudois of Piedmont. If the theory were good for any thing at all, it would have appeared that not only the latter, but all their fellow-mountaineers did once, at least, if not now, rejoice in the same name as themselves. It would then, of course, be essential to prove that they too held the faith of the Apostles, apart and in hostility to Rome, otherwise the unity of the Vaudois, in matters of faith, so strikingly evinced by the application of the territorial name to the religion of the sect, would be sadly compromised with sympathizing Protestants. But as the difficulty would be much too great for their writers to grapple withal, they have wisely let that increment alone, and taken up with an incomplete theory for want of it. It is scarcely necessary to add that no authority whatever is quoted for this etymology, but two are falsified, that of Foncald, who derives the name of Valdenses from *vallis densa*, in order to raise thereon an allegorical reflection after the manner of the middle age, upon the dark vale of death, to which the sectaries had devoted themselves; and that of Eberard de Bethune, who reports another allegorical saying of the Vaudois themselves, "that they so call themselves, because they make profession of living in this world as in a valley of tears." But this valley of tears is not confined to the three valleys of Piedmont. There is all the difference besides in the world between a term allegorized and the same term received in its actual meaning: they have nothing in common but their sound. We must therefore conclude the theory unsupported by authority, notwithstanding the sacrifice of good faith.

But though every evidence should fail them, we are assured that the vulgar opinion of their apostolic origin, of their descent from the imaginary Leo, the opponent of St. Sylvester, and of their descent from Claude of Turin, is quite sufficient to justify itself. For this they choose to term tradition, and while they upbraid it in the Catholic Church, they commend the good Vaudois that relies on his own traditions of apostolic ancestry,

—even if unsupported and refuted. Thus Muston, after contesting the authenticity of Rainier, restores his credit with his Vaudois readers, when he wishes to turn him to the profit of one of his many conjectures.

“After all, it is not so important to know who may have compiled the traditions which are there preserved; enough for us that they existed then, and that they have come down to us; it little matters by the pen of what writer this transmission is operated.”*

Hence also the reason why the impudent pretensions advanced by the rebellious Vaudois, in their petitions to their sovereigns, have been also relied upon by Muston, Peyran and Company, as so many *proofs* of their apostolic antiquity. Conjecture, too, is sometimes brought in to relieve tradition.

“Without pretending to fix the epoch when the dwellers of the valleys received Christianity, we may nevertheless make in this regard the following conjectures, which are quite possible. . . . I confess it, they are but conjectures, but it will be felt that in the events of such high antiquity, and on which we absolutely want historical data, positive proofs ought not to be exacted.”†

And it is upon a body of such contemptible trash as the foregoing, put forward boldly as evidence, that the Vaudois writers hope to continue to mislead their dupes, in the delusion of an apostolic antiquity. Would they were only agreed upon their story! Léger and the earlier ones contented themselves with one genealogy, still entertained by their descendants, those even not excepted who have introduced other schemes of ancestry inconsistent with it. Judging with other heretics that opposition to the Holy See is always a great point gained towards proselytism on their own side, and seeking for some distinguished example of “the progressive element of opposition which developes itself in the north of Italy, . . . and of the inveterate heresy which conceals itself in the Alps . . .” they first fixed their eyes on Claude, the Iconoclast Bishop of Turin, in the ninth century, and after apparently little scrutiny, chose him as the starting *terminus* of their genealogical line. He was a prelate of the Church, who at one time, of course, had been in her communion, and was therefore a proper link to bind them to the first eight centuries of the Church and her apostolical succession. This they endeavoured to effect by proclaiming an exact correspondence of doctrine between the bishop and themselves. But this they have never proved, for the fraud is an impracticable one. Claude was an Iconoclast, and condemned as such alone, and his violence in putting his

* T. i. p. 117.

† Peyr. pp. 32-33.

cold heresy into force, was worthy of the sect whom he served. Nor were the people unmindful of his actions: his death had hardly taken place before every sort of indignity was shown by the multitude to his corpse, till finally they consumed it with fire to prevent its receiving burial, and scattered its ashes to the four winds of heaven. But to establish their descent from this man, the Vaudois writers ought to have made him the depository of more false doctrine than that of Iconoclasm, and have shown him teaching and confirming disciples, who were to become his successors in after days, and by whose means would be supplied the links which are still wanting to connect the worthy prelate of the ninth century with his Vaudois friends in the sixteenth. This they have not done.

"But, is it true that the Vaudois are disciples of Claude in this sense, that, at the epoch when their sect appeared, they faithfully adopted all the doctrines which he had professed? Not even so. 1st. Claude called St Peter the Pastor of the Church of the new alliance, thus designating him as chief of the society established by Jesus Christ. Do the Vaudois recognize in him this title, and this authority? 2ndly. Claude, whose errors we know by the refutations made of them by different contemporary writers, and by the fragments of his writings which remain, has never been accused of having denied a single one of the seven sacraments, received then, as to-day, in the Church Catholic. Do the Vaudois receive them, and are they in this his disciples? 3rdly. Claude knew not the authority of the Spirit, or of private judgment, in interpreting Holy Scripture; he protests, on the contrary, that *he holds to tradition, and to the sentiment of the Fathers who have preceded him*.* Is this also the rule the Vaudois follow? 4thly. In a word, with the exception of honours paid to images and relics of the saints—of their invocation—and of pilgrimages of piety, which Claude rejected; with the exception of the erroneous doctrines which he had imbibed in the School of Felix d' Urgel, and for which, some of his contemporaries regarded him as Arian, others as Nestorian; Claude thought on all the rest of doctrine as the other bishops of his time. . . . Do the Vaudois do the same, and are they of accord with us on all the points in which their pretended patron was? No, doubtless. By what title dare they then call themselves the disciples of a man, whose doctrine they combat on many more points than they admit it? Every one can judge."—p. 326.

Having disposed of the genealogy, which the Vaudois are fond of vindicating among themselves, we come now to the more venerable one which they claim, when they find themselves in the lists with Catholic antagonists. We mean the fable reported of old by Rainier, "*in which*," says Polichdorf, "*they lie to the simple and the ignorant*." Leo, they tell us, was a certain

* Vetera Analecta 92. Præfat. Exposit. in Epist. ad Ephes. ad Lud. prim.

person who lived in the pontificate of St. Sylvester, but of whom all history is silent; which Leo was so scandalized at the conduct of that Pope, in accepting a pretended donation of temporalities in the Church's name, at the hands of the Emperor Constantine, and so apprehensive of the danger which the Church had incurred by her alliance with the state,* that he separated himself from her communion, and hence the Vaudois or Leonists. Now, it is most unfortunate that L  ger, the one of modern critics who dwells most upon this incoherent attempt to provide a better derivation for the name Leonist, than Leona or Lyons will give, seems to credit it the least, and to lean rather to the story of Claude of Turin, for he opens the fable of Leo, by asserting, that inasmuch as Rome was till that period quite pure and stainless, the Churches of the valleys might well remain in the *seventh* century allied to Rome, and therefore, "up to the seventh century, it would be absurd to demand proofs of the Apostolic succession of the Vaudois Churches of the valleys." But when the period of corruption came, they broke off from her communion. "This is what I shall prove more clearly than the sun, to have happened from the end of the EIGHTH century."† The only commentary on the foregoing, is the fact, that St. Sylvester lived in the FOURTH century! But Muston tells us that he accepts the story as a *tradition*, and on this tradition, he builds another of his conjectures, which is,—that during the persecutions under Decius and Valerian, a large body of Christians, from France and Italy, came to the Cottian Alps for shelter; that they were not disturbed there, because, 1st. The Celtic inhabitants civilly withdrew about the time of their arrival. 2ndly. Decius himself could not follow them, being engaged with the Goths in Pannonia, and there defeated. 3rdly. The Huns, the Vandals, the Heruli, and the Lombards, paid no attention to "these little communities, living peaceably among the Alps;" and that, finally, as the date of their arrival tallies very closely, according to Muston, with the supposed

* Surely the Vaudois have swerved from this noble example of disinterestedness. Their ministers at this day receive salaries of no small amount from the King of Sardinia! Nay, more, when the French rewarded their treasurers with the tithes and goods of the Catholic parishes of Luzerne, St. Martin and Inverso-P  rouse, and the administration of the Hospice of Pignerol for their own profit, unmoved by the imminent danger to which they exposed the Churches of their pastoral care, they submitted to these decrees with a wonderful degree of resignation. (See Maranda, *Tableau du Pi  mont*, &c. Turin, l'An. xi.) But will they, at least, tell us, that his apprehension of future harm could, in any case, justify the imaginary Leo's apostacy? Or will the Church of England patronise in the Vaudois the principle, that separation from the Church is lawful, whenever the Church enjoys temporal advantages from connexion with the state?

† Liv. l. ch. xx.

separation under Pope Sylvester, so old an historic monument as the tradition of that event, tells very strongly in support of his conjecture!!

For farther confirmation, he finds, among other positions,—upon the strength of *thirty-four words* of Latin extraction, selected from the valley patois, four of which more nearly approximate to the Latin than their synonyms in any other patois—1st. That the idiom of his three valleys is much more Latinized than any other idiom, “from the mountains of the Tarentaise and the Maurienne, to those of Nice; and also in Piedmont, Provence, and Dauphiny.” 2ndly. That the Christian emigration came from the bosom of Latinity, “in a time when the Latin language was in all its vigour,” which he learnedly concludes, *must* have been the era of Decius and Valerian!! * *Ohe! jam satis.*

Tendimus in Latium: we are still progressing towards the most ancient times of Christianity, and even to times more ancient still, as we proceed with our investigations. M. Peyran, despairing at last of finding any evidence elsewhere, has opened the sacred volume, and has there read:—

“When I shall begin to take my journey into Spain, *I hope that as I pass, I shall see you*, and be brought on my way thither by you, if first, in part, I shall have enjoyed you. But now I shall go to Jerusalem to minister unto the saints. . . . When, therefore, I shall have accomplished this, . . . *I will come by you into Spain.*”—Rom. xv. 24-28.

Therefore, says M. Peyran, St. Paul must have taken his journey into Spain by way of Rome—he must have gone by land thither—he must have passed through Piedmont, and he must have visited and made converts of the Vaudois! Now, the three first assumptions are by no means clearly established to our minds; and as to the last, it requires a separate chain of testimony to arrive at it, seeing that it in no wise depends—a necessary conclusion—from the demonstration of the other three, even were that effected. But, in the first place, there is no evidence that the Apostle fulfilled his purpose; secondly, had he done so, he would have found the sea-voyage the most customary and the most practicable one; thirdly, he might have crossed Italy, without passing by Piedmont—Liguria offered him a shorter road, and mountains less difficult to pass. But, fourthly, even in the other case, he might have crossed ten times through Piedmont or Cisalpine Gaul without touching on the obscure and unfrequented valleys of the Vaudois, which offer,

for the most part, no outward passage to the traveller who enters them.

The anxiety of our Vaudois writers to banish the Gospel to their own valleys, is explained, by the ambition of appearing to have been for so many ages the closed repository of faith. The language of grandeur which they affect on this subject in every page, will excite the smiles of our readers, who have traced with us the ludicrous records of their vain imposture.

"When all was accomplished," says Muston, "that is to say, when the treasure of the Gospel had been deposited in their bosoms, the vessel was closed! The valleys beheld all their foreign communications broken off. The precious deposit of the old religion was not altered; it was preserved in the peaceable forgetfulness of our valleys; and when the time was come, men saw it go forth by degrees from these mountains, like the shining chrysalis, which shakes off the gross covering that encloses her, where they had deemed her dead, and where she had only imbibed a life more beautiful."*

The acting cause of this marvellous preservation, it seems, was—

"The Jungfrau of the south, the mighty genius who watches over the valleys: for it is in the shadow of her wings of granite, that the torch of the Gospel had sheltered her brightness. They extend their gigantic sweep in long chains of mountains which sway the whole horizon."!!†

There is a Vaudois petition extant, drawn up and presented, as Léger tells us, by himself, to Emmanuel Philibert; setting forth a claim to Judaic antiquity, we suppose, for it ends thus; "it is the religion of our fathers, and of our grandfathers, and of the grandfathers of our grandfathers, and others more ancient; our predecessors; and of the holy martyrs, confessors, apostles and *prophets*."‡ We think that this effort, at least, admits no more competition on the part of his brethren in bidding for antiquity. Bossuet, however, might furnish them with a lineage older, if not more desirable. The Albigeois, or new Manichæans, those especial favourites of their own friends the Calvinists, and in all probability their own early allies, possess an antiquity, according to the Bishop of Meaux, such as it would be more suitable to take away from than to add to, if it be true that the seed of their doctrines was sown by Plato.§ Now let MM. Muston and Peyran, once clearly establish that Peter Valdo was a Manichæan, and their genealogy is made at once *à merveille*. Or we recommend them to "Brute the Trojan,"

* Liv. II. 89.

† Liv. I. p. 8.

‡ Lég. liv. I. ch. xxvi.

§ Hist. des Variat. liv. xi. § 7.

through whose antique line Edward I made out his claims to Scotland. Or there is the strange knight in the *Morte d'Arthur*, with his memorable reply to the inquiring Sir Garrain, sprung surely of a lineage more excellent and renowned by far than any of their sober truth-telling history can give. Like them, too, he avowed himself "an enemy to Rome," by family feud of long standing. "My fader is lyncally descended of Alysaunder and of Hector by ryghte lygne, and Duke Josue and Machabeus were of our lyneage." A genealogy infinitely more illustrious than that they have made pretension to, and every whit as authentic!

To attempt an epitome of the religious doctrines professed by the Vaudois, is, in fact, to give an ever-varying record of the effacing of dogmas from the symbol of the sect, and the substitution of others in their stead. Our readers will remember, that until the censure of the Church had branded the superstitious observances of Valdo and his people, their design was evidently no other than to keep well with the Church, and even to illustrate it by the intervention of the new order, which they flattered themselves they were likely to become. Many of his disciples, even, applied to Innocent III to confirm their vows, and establish them as a recognized order; but the Pontiff, blaming their practices, as we learn from the Abbot of Ursperg, and from Ivonet, refused them his countenance, and approved in their stead of another religious order which had just risen, that of the Poor Minors.* Valdo, finding from his condemnation by Pope Lucius, and the Archbishop of Narbonne, as well as from his own rude expulsion from Lyons, that he stood in palpable opposition to all authority in ecclesiastical discipline, first commenced his operations in the field of schism, by affecting to deny episcopal authority altogether, and by continuing to preach in defiance of all inhibition. To this, his disciples added the usurpation of the confessional, and of the Eucharistic consecration, as open to all who wore the sandals of the sect, and were in grace before God. They proclaimed all oaths unlawful, as well as capital punishments. The Church of Rome was pronounced not to be the Church of Jesus Christ, and their sect alone was declared to merit this character. Towards the epoch of the fourth Council of Lateran, however, by which they were anew condemned, they had borrowed new doctrines from the heretics

* This application to the Pope has been represented by Vaudois writers to have for its object, the permission to preach and perform other church offices, independently of Episcopal authority; and, according to them, the request was granted. As a proof of the falsehood of this pretended concession, see Innocent's real sentiments on the question, as displayed in his Letters, lib. xiii. ch. 94, p. 460.

with whom, as we have seen, they had allied themselves against the Catholic Church. By this time, they had, in imitation of the Albigcois, their Perfects and Imperfects, and a code of morals for each class. The contemporary writers agree in representing them as entertaining, in addition to the above doctrines, the following.—Though every falsehood and oath was accounted sin, yet it was held by some, that an *imperfect* might lie, or take an oath to save himself from death. They denied purgatory and prayers for the dead. The priesthood, with the power of forgiving sins, was held to be common to both sexes, and the portion of every good person, *eo instanti* that he or she should attain to the state of grace; and on the other hand, a sacrament was null if administered by an immoral priest. All those engaged in wars, whether against Christians or Saracens, were denounced as homicides. All clerks and priests who held possessions were accounted as children of the devil; and payers of tithes or offerings were also condemned as sinners; and all divisions of land among individuals, and all natural distinctions, were equally forbidden. Church-chaunts were pronounced insults to God, and all the ceremonies and rites of the Church were made the objects of derision. Invocation of saints, reverence of images and relics, observance of fasts and festivals, and obedience to the Roman Church, whom they styled the harlot of the Apocalypse, were prohibited. Divorces were tolerated, at the sole option of either party, without the necessity of any pretext whatever. Finally, they professed to rely on the naked language of Scripture, unassisted by authority or tradition.*

Now, there is not one of the above doctrines for which the Vaudois can claim the merit of originality. 1st. We have the errors of the Donatists, on the nature of the Church, and the nullity of the sacraments in the hands of bad priests. 2ndly. Those of Vigilantius, on saints and relics. 3rdly. Those of the Iconoclasts on image-worship. And the one solitary doctrine, that the Church ought not to be possessed of riches, was the recent work of the two heresiarchs, Marsilius and Arnaldus of Brescia.

“We may even go farther, and maintain, without the dread of being deceived, that of all the errors into which the Vaudois are fallen, there has not been one of which they can claim the *merit of discovery*. They have drawn them all, not from the writings of the old heretics, such as Donatus, Vigilantius, and others, but from among the heretics who had appeared in the same century with themselves; such as Marsilius, Du-

* The authorities for this view of the Vaudois, may be found collected in the Rech. Hist. p. 413, and seq.

randus of Valdach, Basil, Pierre de Bruis, Arnaldus of Brescia, Henricus, the Apostolicals, and the different sects of the Albigeois. There remains then to the Vaudois, in this regard, only the privilege of having preserved, even to the Reformation, heresies, which, at that epoch, were already extinct among the sects from whom the Vaudois had borrowed them.—p. 422.

Of all the seven sacraments, the Vaudois rejected Order alone; and, this by treating it as an accompaniment to the state of grace in both sexes. Auricular confession they practised not only among themselves, but also in the Catholic Churches. Polichdorf tells us that their ministers were wont to counsel them not to tell their greater sins to the priests, for fear of being brought *before the bishops after the usage of Christians, to be confounded before them, and despoiled of their money by the priests whom cupidity devours*. Flathe and others of their friends intimate that this conformity was practised as a cloak to their real opinions. But what an impression does this theory produce of the honesty and courage of these primitive Christians of the valleys! Extreme unction they only rejected because they were poor, for they averred that it was reserved for the rich, and not imparted by the priests to the poor also. Confirmation they admitted, but denied that none but bishops could administer it, and they received it from their ministers and their laymen quite indiscriminately. In the Eucharist they denied a transubstantiation until the moment of reception by a communicant in the state of grace. Among the many other doctrines of a trivial cast, which they professed to build upon Scripture, we find the following:—

“We see that it was a matter received into a maxim and an usage among the sectaries, to turn into derision the practice of the Catholics of building churches and meeting there for divine office. They regarded them as objects useless and superstitious, and gave them only the names of barn or granary, saying that it was much better to pray in a stable, in a room, or in a bed, than to go to church. Also they blamed those strongly who founded or endowed churches, or gave them legacies, or any donations whatsoever. The clergy, according to them, ought not to have any prebend, any endowment, any fixed revenue. The priests ought all to work with their hands, and had not the right to live but at this price. It was offensive to God to secure to them a rent, or revenue, or stipend of whatever kind it might be.* . . . It was the same with cemeteries. They said that it was better to be interred any where than in the place blessed and destined for the common sepulture of the faithful. Also, they interred their ministers in their caves, in their cellars, or in any other place whatsoever, rather than in a cemetery. The religious

* “It is certain that the Vaudois ministers in our times have made the most complete abjuration of these doctrines.”

chaunt of our churches was, according to them, only a *barking of dogs*, and all the prayers which are recited there, were not worth one solitary Pater Noster recited in bed or elsewhere. The use of bells and belfries, destined to warn the faithful of the hours of assemblage in the churches, was the most superstitious thing imaginable. They showed no more favour to colleges, universities, and to every sort of studies, regulated and privileged. All this was, in their eyes, only folly, vanity, and loss of time. . . . They comprehend in the same anathemas, synods, councils, and every sort of ecclesiastical assemblies.”—p. 437.

The above doctrines seem to have been professed with but little variation down to the sixteenth century. At this period, the ignorance and indifference of the people who held them, seemed to promise the same quiet death to the errors of Valdo, which had befallen every heresy in its turn that had ever arisen within the Church, and which the heresies of the sixteenth century are themselves doomed to undergo. But the Reformation, with its rise of new sects, more powerful and more numerous than themselves, and their establishment in Switzerland and Germany, awoke them from their apathy, and tempted them to seek an admission, at the price of conformity, into the ranks of the recent rebellion. It was true, that there was as much opposition between their own heresy and that of Calvin, as already had separated them from communion with the Church Universal. But long supineness had rendered them indifferent to orthodoxy, and they were prepared to welcome any change but that which should bring them back to Catholicity, the object of their endless hatred. Besides, their historian, M. Muston, boasts that “the Vaudois never had their dogmatic opinions so inflexibly decreed by formulas and human authority, as they were after the Reformation. . . . Also, it is proper to admit, that they do not appear to have always understood one another in a definite manner upon these particulars.” Accordingly, the deputation which they sent to Œcolampadius, to treat of the union they desired to effect with the Calvinist body, after setting forth that they were much agreed with the reformed Churches, consulted him upon a variety of questions of doctrine, on which they were not sufficiently certain. Among these were the following: whether the distinction of sin into original, venial, and mortal, were good; and also that of ignorance, into invincible, negligent, and gross: how they were to distinguish the ceremonial and the political precepts; and whether they had been all abolished by the coming of Jesus Christ: whether the allegorical interpretation of the Scriptures were admissible, and what were the canonical books of the Old and New Testament. As little informed they seem to have been on the question of morals, for they asked him if it

was justifiable to assassinate the false brothers, who sometimes betrayed their ministers to the Catholics. These questions were headed by a methodical statement of their opinions and practices, which, it is remarkable, differs only in some trifling points with the account which we have already copied from the contemporaries of their first founders. The last article of the summary, too, admitted, that by weakness, or dread of their persecutors, they caused their children to be baptized by the priests, and themselves communicated at mass.* The result, of course, was their submission to Geneva,—precipitate, complete, and unconditional. “*Their habitual humility,*” says Muston, “*and a distrust of themselves,* pushed too far, led them to admit opinions, which they at first rejected.”—p. 350.

Elsewhere, this author characterizes this complete abandonment of Peter Valdo for John Calvin, as “*some modifications conformable to the rites of the reformed which the Vaudois worship has received since the fourteenth century*” (p. 107), and “*as innovations introduced into the Vaudois discipline,* probably by condescension for the Reformers.” (Pref. p. xiii.) The amalgamation, however, was complete. Henceforth, the valleys were Calvinistic, and the Vaudois peculiarities vanished into thin air. The permission of the princes of Savoy was sought, and sometimes obtained, for the erection of churches and belfries, and the suspension of church-bells; and cemeteries were opened for the Genevese mode of interment. Moreover, Geneva beheld the Vaudois youth, candidates for the ministry, crowding to her seminaries for that instruction which their forefathers would have censured as heathenish. We have already seen that these would-be successors of the ancient inhabitants of the valleys, required only the opportunities, which Jacobin confiscations and royal munificence have since afforded them, to prove that they were ready even to forswear the apostolic poverty which their ancestors enjoined to Churchmen up to the sixteenth century. At the present day, these ministers have shared the common destiny of Geneva; Socinus and not Calvin is the object of their love, and under their guidance the hapless three valleys seemed doomed to undergo a third religious revolution. In the meantime, they are happy in being the objects of sympathies manifold and various. The Oxford divine, who believes himself the best medium between superstition and infidelity, venerates the Vaudois because of their episcopal and apostolic succession from the fourth century, which, in his fancy, he gives to their

* See the whole of this curious document, with the proceedings thereupon, in Reichat's Hist. de la Reform. en Suisse, tòm. iii. lib. vii.

ancient Church; and if they have abandoned these high privileges for the "cold porridge" of Geneva, he hopes that heaven and the Church Missionary Society may do much to restore them. The Scoto-Calvinist and Independent exult in the living negation afforded by this democratical Church of the valleys to the Episcopalian challenge of Christian antiquity. The Unitarian, in no wise solicitous for the past, yet smiles to see another prize falling almost into his arms; and hails the glorious future which awaits the Vaudois at the end of their perilous wanderings. Of these, we believe, the Unitarian's expectations the best-founded. The tone of the Vaudois writers, whom we have analysed in this article, is certainly such as would find favour in the halls of modern Geneva. For M. Muston, the Trinity is but "the dogma formulated by Theophilus of Antioch, and published by Tertullian.....supported on a passage the interpolation of which is at this day recognized." (Liv. iii. p. 100-1.) This same minister of the gospel in another place (Liv. i. 46) thus gives his views on the rule of life: "These little distinctions (*religious* differences) established among men, and by men, exist not before God. The manner in which we shall have done well, according to our heart, reason, and conscience,—this is the only rule after which all his children will be judged." What! the only rule! is the gospel left quite out of the question? and "Little matters it," he says elsewhere, "what worship rears its altars, provided that it be to the same God." (Id. p. 35.) Alas! what a departure from the unction, force, and eloquence with which that holy man, Robert Olivetan, the contemporary and kinsman of Calvin himself, warned the Vaudois of his day against the danger of remaining without the pale of their Church, then recently renewed by the Calvinising process. Hear him offering to the Catholic Church the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue, and then *blush for the degenerate Muston*.

"Poor Church! the people which makes thee this present has seen thee, not certainly without great regrets and compassion, in the service of rigorous and unkind masters, enjoining and commanding thee a thousand things to be done one after the other: it has seen thee go, come, run, trot, and bustle; ill-treated, over-driven, ill-accounted, torn, soiled, scratched, dishevelled, chilled, murdered, mutilated, beaten, disfigured, and in such piteous state, that we should rather have judged thee some poor servant, slave, or scullion, than the daughter and heiress of the universal ruler and possessor, and the well-beloved of his only Son..... What charge and load of weighty constitutions has he (thy friend) seen thee draw before thy most religious masters; thou hast no sooner discharged the one than they have reloaded thee with the other; and these good men commanded that thou shouldst fast the greater part of the time, and all to advantage and profit the insatiable appetites

of such gluttons, and slow bellies, and evil beasts.....Now then, poor little Church, which art yet in the state of servant and housemaid, through all the furious faxes and magisterial threats of so many grim and sour masters as thou hast, go and rub clean thy rags, all dusty and clayed from having so much run, turned, and bustled by the miry way of vain traditions; go wash thy hands, which are all dirty from doing the servile work of iniquity; go cleanse thine eyes, all bleared by reason of the negligence which thou must have had for thyself to be more diligent after the wants of superstitions and hypocrisy: dost thou prize more the sophistical bawlings and troubles of these hairbrained men, than the pleasant dialogues and conversation of thy friend Jesus Christ? Forget only thine own, and the house of him whom thou hast holden for thine own (to wit the Pope), and that traitress of a stepmother whom thou hast long called mother (to wit the Roman Church), and come boldly with them who have made themselves execration for Christ, not for their misdeeds, whose titles are these, to wit: insulted, blamed, driven about, decried, disowned, abandoned, excommunicated, anathematized, confiscated, imprisoned, tormentingly confined (*géhennés*), banished, laddered, mitred, bespitten, scaffolded, cropped of ears, pincered, branded, fired, drawn, roasted, stoved, burned, drowned, beheaded, dismembered, and other like glorious and magnificent things of the kingdom of heaven!"—p. 282.

One word as to the pretended persecutions of the Vaudois, and we shall close this lengthened article. The reproach comes with an ill-grace from English Conservatives, with Ireland before their eyes. Those whose fathers carried fire and sword into Innisfail to implant there a faith foreign as themselves, would have no right to complain even though the Dukes of Savoy had in reality with fire and sword resisted that immigration of outlawed French in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, which bore with it into Piedmont a new creed in religion as in morals, in social relations as in civil allegiance. And if at the present day in a kingdom which still does not enjoy the blessings of a constitution, there remain some privileges open to the other subjects of Sardinia, but forbidden to the Vaudois, they are not competent to deplore the harsh injustice of that exclusion, who battled with all their might, till resistance became bootless, against the admission of Catholics to the common liberties of their native land, and that too a land which prides itself on the possession of the freedom its Catholic sons once shed their blood to maintain. But we do not rely upon this obvious answer to the Anglican railers at Sardinian intolerance, preferring to deny the charge in the terms in which it is couched. We say, then, that the Vaudois irruption into the mountains of Piedmont, would have passed unnoticed by the sovereigns of Savoy, but for the general confusion and havoc which every where marked its traces. The

jealousies between the native Savoyards and the new comers, between the teachers of new and seditious doctrines and those who held fast their old faith and time-honoured allegiance, begat a succession of disturbances which wasted the strength of the state, and called forth prevention and punishment. Add to this, the constant rebellions fomented among the Vaudois by their ministers, authorized by their own doctrines, and speculated on by the foreign foe, and we have at once a very sufficient reason why the rulers of that frontier state, the dukedom of Savoy, should interpose with summary vigour, and even with severity, to crush the serpent rather than to scotch it. Let us remember, that among the doubts which Ecolampadius was requested to resolve, there was one, whether the civil laws which regulate the world are approved of by God,—that the division of the earth into distinct kingdoms, and of men into peoples and nations, was reprobated as sinful,—that they forbade the custom of property among their faithful,—that they condemned oath-taking as mortally sinful,—that they treated as an assassin the judge who condemned another to death,—that they denounced as murderous all who were engaged in a war however just,—that they proclaimed all popes, emperors, kings, and princes, who should act otherwise in these particulars than they would have them, as indubitably damned,—and that, finally, they exerted all their zeal, and all their influence, to propagate generally these doctrines, so incompatible with the welfare, or even the existence, of society. Let us call all this to our recollection, and we shall not wonder that the Dukes of Savoy have done their best to discourage the profession of Vaudois opinions, and to circumscribe the sectaries in their means of mischief. In general, Botta, the historian of Italy, misses no occasion of doing despite to the Catholics, and giving praise to their enemies; but of the Dukes of Savoy, even he has been constrained to say:

“These religionists, tolerated at first sufficiently peaceably by the princes of Savoy, while they remained in quiet, were afterwards combated when they became turbulent and put forth greater pretensions, at the example of the wars which had broken forth in France in consequence of the reformed religion. The power which the Huguenots had acquired in struggling against the sovereign power, served the Vaudois at once for example and support. Thence it happened that these valleys, which had before been sufficiently tranquil, and had even been able to furnish a peaceable and sure asylum to the Protestants, who fled the persecutions which they had endured in France, became troubled and filled with blood, by discords the most terrible that ever mortals have had to suffer.”—*Lib. xxxv. p. 35.*

We have already noticed the loyal and patriotic part which the Vaudois took during the passage of the French army into

Piedmont. We, of all men, are no advocates of exclusive systems; but we cannot help feeling, that the Sardinian government had some justification for its system of caution and prevention, when we witness the base and venal adhesion of this people, as of one man, to the French standard, against their sovereign and their own mountain independence. The endowments which the new government, on its establishment at Turin, heaped upon their pastors, tell pretty plainly under what influence the treasonable junction was accomplished.

The same conqueror who slew old and young unarmed in the streets of Drogheda, remonstrated against the severities of the Duke of Savoy to his Vaudois rebels. It answered a purpose. And the orangemen of our days pause from the soothing remembrance of Rathcormac and Iniscarra, and from the anticipation of future fields of equal slaughter, to lift up the voice of indignation and mourning over the fancied picture of Vaudois suffering. The party palate must be gratified; and truly the caterers are not idle. Enter the library of the British Museum—you will see them there each with his quire of foolscap spread before him, and at his elbow a host of works penned and published on his side of the question years ago, but now dead and forgotten; biographical dictionaries and encyclopædiæ complete his munition. From these he is culling, with all the spirit of penmanship, whole passages of a length so formidable, that in a few days he has obtained almost sufficient matter for his single duodecimo volume, hot-pressed, and quite enough to authorize his publisher to announce the approaching appearance of a new work on the Vaudois, or on the Albigenses, or on the Culdees, or whatever else the subject may chance to be. That any such will take the trouble to peruse our pages,—or, perusing them, will have the candour to abate their foregone conclusions,—at least, until they have made the experience of a more careful search into authorities,—we cannot hope. Our purpose is not with them, but with their readers. If we shall have been the means of putting them in possession of a more honest and unglossed account of the state of the Vaudois question, than they are likely to derive from the shallow pages of English polemics, or of pointing to those sources of information whence a purer truth may be imbibed, than their Gillys will supply them with,—we have not in vain assayed the reviewer's duty, in the hope of introducing to their notice the valuable work which we have had such frequent occasion to quote in the most unqualified spirit of approbation.

ART. IV. — 1. *Contrasts, or a Parallel between the Noble Edifices of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries, and similar Buildings of the Present Day; shewing the present decay of Taste.* By A. Welby Pugin, architect. 4to. Lond. 1836.

2. *A Reply to Observations which appeared in "Fraser's Magazine" for March 1837, on a work entitled "Contrasts."* By the Author of that Publication. 8vo. London. 1837.

MR. PUGIN is an architect of acknowledged merit, and of established reputation. He is one of the many who have been, in late years, attracted to the ancient and true Church, by her secondary prerogatives of taste, beauty, and surpassing grandeur in her outward forms; and who, approaching her nearer, and discovering in her all that can satisfy the intelligence and the heart, as well as charm the sense and the imagination, have sought and found their happiness in her bosom. Within these few months, we have observed the *Siècle*, a notorious French paper, accuse M. von Haller of having joined the same Church, rather from an admiration of its social and political principles than from a conviction of its doctrines,—rather as a publicist than a theologian. Let not Mr. Pugin, then, feel other than flattered, if a similar charge has been made against him by a journal* too well known for its habitual, amiable candour, to be believed by any one when it treats of Catholics. The "Contrasts" is a book full of life and spirit, and amusing, though unto sadness. It is a "comparative anatomy" of architectural science. It does not represent this science through its different stages, such as was naturally to be expected, as a growing, perfectible science, of which the later periods display a grander or chaster development of artistic principles than the earlier. On the contrary, it exhibits the same members and forms as were once joined together in all the symmetry of fair proportions, now clumsily hung to one another in monstrous shapes and ill-assorted connexions. It shows us, if we may so speak, the organs of social life, through which alone, as a moral, or a political body, a nation can live or breathe, in its religious and public edifices,—once adapted most perfectly to every required end,—noble in their development, sound in their structure, and healthy in their action; but now presenting no trace of fitness, beauty, or design, to prove that the "mens diviniore" has any part in contriving or producing them. If the light,

* "Fraser's Magazine," March 1837.

symmetrical, elegant form of the antelope, be contrasted with the awkward, cumbrous, and disgusting configuration of the sloth, there will not be a greater dissimilarity of similar parts, a wider disconformity of adaptation to the same actions, nor a greater impossibility of referring the two to the same class or genus, than there is when we compare the architecture of the two periods selected by Mr. Pugin.

But his plates present us only the phenomena, of which we naturally desire an explanation. It is true, indeed, that the eye decides almost intuitively. Each plate presents a double view of some public edifice, such as it was in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and such as it is now-a-days constructed. We begin with the most solemn part of a cathedral, its altar. On one side is the exquisite screen of Durham Abbey, not as now remaining after the ravages of Iconoclast reformers, an unmeaning fabric of matchless tracery, but all its niches filled with holy images, the altar restored, and the priest celebrating thereon the august mysteries : such, in short, as the faithful saw it in 1430. Beside it stands the chancel of Hereford Cathedral, such as modern taste has made it, be-pillared and be-pannelled with broken entablatures, pediments within pediments, but without cornices, a mere piece of carpenter's work, with a mean cloth-covered table, on which, as on a *buffet*, are displayed the flagons and salvers of the communion service. Who sees not that one is a Catholic, the other a Protestant, cathedral? Next come parochial churches; *here*, from the wide portals of an ancient church, streams forth a picturesque procession, and pours over the flights of steps, which give a nobler elevation to the massive tower and lofty building; *there*, from the shade of Nash's disproportioned circular portico in Langham Place, topped by the unimaginable ugliness of his column-girded "extinguisher," trips out a slender congregation. Who can doubt which is the Catholic, and which the Protestant parish?

Of the next plate, "Contrasted Royal Chapels," we are not sure that the attorney-general ought not to take cognizance. It is evidently Mr. Pugin's intention to bring royalty into contempt. What else can he mean by exhibiting to the public a chapel royal, which he pretends is to be seen in the heathenish Pavilion at Brighton, looking to all intents and purposes like a concert-room, with a double gallery, supported by spindle columns, narrow overgrown pilasters, shooting up the walls to the ceiling, and a ball-room assembly, met, to all appearance, not so much for worshipping God, as for hearing man, under the form of a portly dignitary, who, perched in a lofty pulpit, is no doubt preaching on the duty of mortification. Now, this

treasonable representation is rendered doubly evident by the juxtaposition of fine old Windsor chapel, as it used to be when its choristers and clergy sung there the solemn mass. What is this but a clear insinuation that the presence of royalty itself can hardly throw an interest round Protestant worship, when performed in the temples which itself has raised, in true accordance with its own tasteless forms; while the sublime functions of the old church exactly harmonize with the character of those solemn and sumptuous edifices which it erected? The one thought only of making a chapel for a king, the other, of raising a temple to God.

Sometimes we are really inclined to suspect Mr. Pugin of more occult, but not therefore the less dangerous, malice. When we look at his "Contrasted Public Conduits," we cannot resist the temptation of believing him to have in his eye a most wicked allegory. It is plain, that the beautiful, ornamental fountain, ever affording living waters to those that seek them, without effort and without price, symbolizes the old and generous religion, under whose domination it was erected; while the ungraceful, stiff, selfish-looking pump, with its handle chained down, and the child that comes for water, chid and sent elsewhere by its legal guardian, the policeman, while a long list of fees for ecclesiastical rites stares from the wall, is no unapt emblem of the law-established Church. But what shall we say of his "Contrasted Episcopal Residences?" On examining this plate, we know not whether indignation, or pity, or contempt, be the uppermost feeling in our minds, towards the degraded taste of our country, which could allow such a mansion as old Ely Palace to be sold, pulled down, and replaced by the mean brick buildings of Ely Place; but, at the same time, it does not at all surprise us, that a bishop who has daughters to bring out, and sons to get into the Guards, should have considered a Gothic house in Holborn a vulgar bore, encumbered, as it was, with cloisters, libraries, and large chapels, and preferred a neat, three-windowed house, in a more fashionable neighbourhood. Still, it argues great want of tenderness in Mr. Pugin, to contrast the two so prominently, seeing that the difference of taste has arisen from such delicate feelings of parental solicitude as we have alluded to. For, it is evident, that a married bishop must have "nursery windows;" and, as Mr. Pugin himself tells us, that "the great test of architectural beauty is the fitness of the design to the purpose for which it is intended; and that the style of a building should so correspond with its use, that the spectator may at once perceive the purpose for which it was erected," (p. 1) he must own, that the Bishop of

Ely's *genteel* house in Dover Street, is a much better architectural specimen of what a Protestant bishop's residence should be, than the cloistered palace of Holborn, which clearly belongs to times when bishops gave hospitality, afforded means of study to poor scholars, were daily seen at public prayers, and gave a third of their incomes to their children, the poor,—things utterly useless now-a-days, as long as we have plenty of inns, abundant reading-rooms, and sufficient poor-rates.

It is, therefore, sufficiently plain, from the bare inspection of Mr. Pugin's plates, that he means us to infer, that the decline, or rather the barbarization, of our national architecture, is traceable to the change of religion in our country, commonly called the Reformation. His text, however, more fully explains his object, if any explanation be required, and presents a bold and masterly sketch of the changes which that unhappy event introduced into his noble science. He glows with an honest and merited indignation, in contemplating the sacrilegious and barbarous scenes of early Protestantism, its mutilations, its desecrations, its spoliations and destructions, worse by far than ever Goth or Vandal perpetrated in a Christian land. He comments with deserved severity and sarcasm upon the modern successors of the race, who have done almost more, by avaricious neglect, to destroy, or, by ill-judged restorations, to deface, the remnants of our once glorious cathedrals and churches, than the fanatics who first assailed them. He proves, what every one's eye must readily convince him of, that the ancient cathedrals are every way unsuitable for Protestant worship, and that, even after they have been cut down, boxed off, and made what is called comfortable, they are still unfit for the purpose to which they are now applied.

In fact, it is evident that the Catholic and Protestant religions have two essentially different principles of worship, and two different standards of proportions; both of which must necessarily influence the form and characteristics of their religious edifices. The worship of the Catholic Church is based upon the belief in rites and practices, endowed with essential holiness, and capable of communicating this quality to external objects; that of the Protestant, entirely on the uncertain influence of a human agency. Take the clergyman out of his pulpit and reading desk, and there is nothing in the parish church which warns or invites the members of his flock to kneel and pray. But the Catholic peasant goes not past the door of his church without an act of reverence; the traveller, who enters it through curiosity, kneels for a brief space to pray, before proceeding to examine its paintings or tombs; and this at a time when no

service is actually performing. And why? because the belief in a sacrament wherein our Blessed Redeemer is ever present, inspires a reverence for the entire temple in which it reposes; the very celebration of its solemn mysteries leaves a savour of holiness throughout the building, which renders it, through the day and night, a holy place. In like manner, if we suppose the Protestant preacher to be indeed in his desk, but one of the congregation placed at such a distance as not to hear a syllable of what he says, for example,—just entering at the western door of a cathedral, while service is going on beyond the screen,—there is no common tie between the two, and the stranger can no more be a partaker of the worship than if he were outside the church-yard. On the other hand, if the Catholic have passed the threshold of the vastest cathedral, and see the holy sacrifice offered upon its most distant altar, he will kneel in adoration, sensible that he has come into the presence chamber of the King of Kings. Hence it follows, that to places of Protestant worship, it is the limited faculty of hearing that must suggest proportions; while the sight, almost boundless and quite insatiable, the boldest and divinest of the senses, gives the standard of measure and proportion to the Catholic temple. When our ancestors knelt upon the battle-field, during the celebration of mass, there was a sublimity in the simultaneous act of adoration directed by thousands towards one object, which their eye could reach: whereas, were it desired that a modern Protestant army should be made to pray before risking their lives in battle, it would be necessary for each regimental chaplain to read the service separately to his corps, if, indeed, it would not be necessary for each company to have prayers by itself. Whenever Protestants have to build churches or meeting houses, the first object in view has necessarily been, that the preacher should be audible in every part. This rule is incompatible with grandeur of dimensions or proportions; it imposes the necessity of introducing galleries, which destroy the unbroken loftiness of a building, and, what is still worse, makes the clergyman instead of the altar the principle object of attention. Where they have overlooked their proper standard, as when they built St. Paul's, or adopted our old cathedrals, they have necessarily reduced the body of the edifice to the degraded condition of a vestibule to the chancel, wherein alone are performed acts of public worship. But in Catholic countries, as once in our own, every foot of the building, from wall to wall, and from pavement to ceiling, belongs to God, and is consecrated to his worship. The threshold is as secure from profanation as the sanctuary; the sister arts are engaged to decorate the walls

which architecture has raised, from the door to the altar, though with due subordination of parts; and the eye finds all that it desires,—not only grandeur of design, but corresponding magnificence of execution.

Perhaps we have been unjust to Mr. Pugin, by substituting our language for his, in thus delivering our sentiments. He has indeed done ample justice to his subject; and shown, by the warmth of his expressions, that he has deeply drank of that enthusiasm which ought to be a characteristic mark of distinction between the architect and the builder. The writer in *Fraser* was probably unable to comprehend this feeling: to him it could only be an object of ridicule. The “Regent Street” school—the aspirers after commissions to build streets at so much per yard, and to erect nondescript churches, that must return, by their sittings, so much *per cent*—could not be expected to trouble their heads about the holier appropriation of their art, but must have been astonished how any one could have been led, by professional study, to examine into the uses and purposes of our venerable cathedrals, and so to ascertain the grounds of doctrines which could alone have inspired the idea of such glorious edifices. Hence the groundless, and really ungentelemanly, charge made by the reviewer, that Mr. Pugin had returned to the faith of his fathers—the source of every pure artistic inspiration, only from a love of architectural magnificence. There must be a sad dearth of topics for real censure, when a reviewer descends to such unwarrantable attributions of unworthy motives, for acts accountable to God alone. But the critic, not so content, sends Mr. Pugin for information on the Catholic religion, to a work which maintains the emblem of the Holy Ghost, mentioned in the New Testament, to be derived from Venus’s dove; the eagle, characteristic of St. John, from the bird of Jove; and the lion of St. Mark, from that of Cybele! Such is the learning, antiquarian and theologian, of the critic in *Fraser’s Magazine*!

But there is another charge made against our author, by his critic, on which we intend to enlarge more fully, because we have noticed frequent misapprehensions on the subject, both in books and conversation. Mr. Pugin is in love, as he should be, with the pointed architecture. Now this just admiration of the sacred architecture of his own country, is distorted by his critic into a condemnation of every other style. Nay, he is charged with even treating disrespectfully the magnificent basilica of St. Peter’s at Rome. There is not a line in the “*Contrasts*” that can warrant this malignant charge; nor should we notice it but

for the mistakes which we see daily committed on this very subject. Again and again have we been provoked by finding our best friends unable, or unwilling, to afford room in their minds for a two-fold admiration of objects, each perfect in its kind, because each the perfection of principles essentially just, and brought by ages of experience to a full maturity. To our ears, the wish that St. Peter's at Rome, or the cathedral of Pisa, had been built in the pointed style, sounds as harsh and absurd, as a regret, were such expressed, that York cathedral or Westminster Abbey was not erected of the Corinthian order. The arts of a country are part of its social growth—they follow step by step the progress of a nation in its advance and decline; and to transplant its principles from one country to another would only be to rear an exotic that must dwindle and degenerate.

We do not mean to say that one country must not borrow from another; the pointed architecture, whatever its origin, spread from country to country; and England, France, and Germany, have respectively produced specimens worthy of being considered models. But then each of these nations enjoyed a perfect community of ideas with its neighbours, upon every point which could suggest artistic principles. The same feudal system required baronial castles of the same form; the same religion called for the same arrangements in the Church, the same symbolic decoration, and equal vastness of dimension. Each too had to choose its architectural forms, for there was no previous system in their countries to imitate or improve; their architecture arose with Christianity; and though its first and ruder forms were drawn from Roman specimens, as Dr. Milner has proved,* yet this rude germ received its development, growth, and perfection, from causes which could not have produced the same effects in Italy.

This observation calls for farther explanation. No one who has examined the point can for a moment doubt, that what is called the Saxon order, that is, the semicircular arch resting upon thick pillars, with lighter pillars running from these to the vault, is borrowed from Italy. This will appear more probable, from what we shall say in the sequel. Now in Italy, the style of architecture thus copied was a degradation and corruption of one older and fairer; in the North it was a first essay, the adoption of a fundamental principle. Without rules extraneous to itself, without a knowledge of the earlier state from which it had degenerated, even without models by which to restore it, our ancestors could not possibly have thought of going back from it

* *Treatise on the Ecclesiastical Architecture of England*, p. 23, seq.

to an older style; but had only the natural course before them of straightforward improvement, of studying the capabilities of the system which they had adopted, of discovering in it new and rich combinations, of giving it airy lightness and elegance, and more strange than all, of basing upon this very quality a character of sublimity and grandeur, which till then had been considered the result only of massiveness and colossal bulk. And right marvellously did our forefathers achieve all this, and even more. For they invented a new system of ornaments, and other adjuncts of matchless beauty, but imagined in a spirit of essential harmony with the greater members of their architecture; inventions truly of the highest order, whereof not a hint was derived from anything that had gone before; the window glowing with transparent mosaic—the flying buttresses, like wings that by their lightness seem to bear the huge fabric into the air, yet knit together its limbs in everlasting strength—the purled pinnacles, which, rising from every prominence of the walls, and topped by their flowers or *finials*, break and conceal, as with a parterre, the monotony of the roof: in fine, the tapering spire, which appears to connect the earthly edifice with the higher sphere, scarcely seeming to press upon the massive tower that supports it.

In Italy, however, it was far otherwise. The style of architecture, from which the pointed sprung, served there to recal the mind of able men to the earlier system from which it had itself arisen: for the history of preceding styles was traceable through monuments of every age, back to the purest forms. The study of these begot in them the desire, not so much of basing a new system upon what they possessed, as of restoring, as far as was compatible with circumstances, the ancient rules. They felt as we now do upon the same subject. For the monstrous abortions of modern architects, intended for pointed architecture, only inspire one who loves art with an anxiety to see a return to the noble and beautiful style of which they are degenerate imitations.

But to elucidate this matter more fully, it may be useful to run hastily over the history of sacred architecture, and explain the various causes which operated upon it, and worked out, in the end, the two great modern systems, of the pointed, and what we shall call the Italian styles. To such as have not travelled, it may be necessary to explain, that by the latter we understand the plan adopted by Sir Christopher Wren in St. Paul's; that is, when the nave is separated from the aisles by wide arches, between which are pilasters, or perhaps half-columns.

As the Jews, under the direction of God, adopted Egyptian

forms in the architecture of their tabernacle, and later of their temple, as being those to which they were most accustomed, so was it to be expected naturally, that the early Christians would select from the edifices which surrounded them the types of their new ecclesiastical buildings. Only such writers as Middleton or Blount could be unreasonable enough to imagine, that Christianity imposed the necessity of inventing new styles of architecture, lest it should appear to have adopted anything, however innocent, from heathenism. However, for the consolation of such as have made to themselves a bugbear of all that pagans ever did, we may repeat what is pretty generally known, that the ancient Christians, not considering the general form of heathen temples suitable to their worship, nor their dimensions equal to their wants, preferred the *Basilica*, or court of justice, for a model. It was reserved for the builders of new St. Pancras's, and some other London churches, to make their edifices look as much as possible like a pagan temple, even to the adopting of caryatides to support their tasteless side-porticoes. Agincourt, whose splendid "History of Art" is lying before us as we write, very reasonably supposes, that Constantine, before laying the foundation of his many splendid churches, would first consult the Supreme Pontiff respecting the requisites for such buildings, the proportions and parts best suited to the rites therein to be celebrated. It would be seen that the Basilica possessed all the important features required; for it consisted of a parallelogram, divided into three unequal breadths by two rows of columns, and ending in an apsis or semicircular recess. This served for a chair in which the bishop and other officiating ministers sat: the altar being between them and the people. The Church of St. Agnes, near Rome, is a basilica of this form, built by the first Christian emperor; and exhibits all these parts, as they were first arranged. It has also the singular feature of an upper range of pillars, that form a gallery without disturbing the simplicity of the edifice.

But the early Christians, in thus building churches upon the basilican model, were not guided by a poor spirit of imitation. They modified their type so as to give it a grandeur of dimensions never attempted by their heathen forefathers, and a still greater adaptation of parts to the forms of their religion. The architects who planned the old churches of St. Peter, St. John, and St. Paul at Rome, must have been men, who, if cast upon times when a happier execution of details was practised, would have been immortalized by their works. They prolonged the building to a length unknown in previous times; doubled the orders of columns, and consequently the number of aisles; they interposed

between the body of the church and its semicircular termination a noble transept, which gave the form of Christianity's symbol to its churches, and they united this new part to the nave by a bold triumphal arch, as it was called, corresponding to the arch of the apsis, and enriched, like it, with glittering mosaic. In all this there were essential deviations from the form of the old basilicas, sufficient to warrant our considering the plan of the larger churches as of purely Christian origin.

But, at the same time, it was natural that, when such edifices were erected, the rules of architecture then in use should be applied. Rome had already begun to fall into decay, and many of its enormous edifices could not be kept in repair. Their very use in heathen times rendered them almost useless now; theatres and amphitheatres were but little encouraged by the new faith of the empire; *thermæ* or baths had been multiplied beyond the wants of the diminished population, and were edifices destined rather for effeminate luxury than for wholesome recreation. While these and similar buildings, tombs and temples, presented an inexhaustible store of sumptuous materials for building, it required but little sagacity to perceive, that the decayed state of art, even in its most purely mechanical departments, would not allow anything to be produced approaching to them in perfection. Hence the plan was adopted, which the Arch of Constantine proves to have been followed in profane monuments, of seizing on the materials which older edifices afforded. When cornices as well as pillars were at hand, the two were joined together, and the colonnade presented the general features of the more ancient portico. But, on many occasions, as in the churches before mentioned, preference was given to the plan which had come greatly into use in the reign of Dioclesian, of throwing arches from pillar to pillar, and drawing either a complete entablature, or a slight cornice, over them. This arrangement shocks, it must be owned, a classical eye; but still deserves no small indulgence.

In the first place, the spirit of the Christian worship sought for elevation in the interior of its buildings, far beyond those of heathen times. This could never have been attained by having a single colonnade, and then the ceiling, as in Grecian and Roman temples; for the tallest order would have been insufficient to reach the elevation attempted in the large Christian churches. An immense height of wall or attic was, therefore, required between the entablature and the roof, to raise the latter to its proper elevation, such as would destroy proportion between the columns and their superincumbent weight, at least as far as the eye is concerned. Notwithstanding the unparalleled beauty of *Sta. Maria Maggiore*, no one can fail to be struck with the great

distance between the cornice and the ceiling, and to feel that the colonnade is crushed by the high wall above. Either, therefore, the grand feature of loftiness was to be sacrificed to the laws of pagan architecture, or these must be somewhat modified. The early Christians never would have dreamed of the first alternative, they were therefore driven to the latter. Now, by turning arches over the pillars, and thus elevating the cornice, a fairer proportion was obtained between the parts below and above its dividing line. Secondly, we think any lover of art will pardon this departure from ancient classical rules, when he considers that in all human probability, we owe to it entirely the modern systems, whether pointed or Italian. We unhesitatingly say, that had the classical system been still followed, of horizontal entablatures resting upon the pillars; in other words, had not arches been thus early introduced into church architecture, all sorts of incongruities might, indeed, have been committed—even Boromini's monstrous perversions of the old orders might have been introduced; but the first step would not have been made from which, by a series of natural gradations, arose the magnificent glories of our northern style, and the classical though original beauties of Brunelleschi's, Bramante's, and Michelangiolo's, compositions. Nor can we conceive by what other course either of these would ever have been attained.

The style introduced into ecclesiastical architecture under Constantine, was naturally continued by his immediate successors in the Empire. But after their connexion with Italy had been weakened or rather broken by the Gothic dominion, new modifications took place, which deserve a greater attention than they generally receive. Before, however, leaving that earlier period, we must notice some important matters relating to our subject, which greatly influenced the forms of churches, especially at a later period. Long before the time of Constantine, the Christians had places of worship, and it was not to be expected that, in their prosperity, they would easily forget the humble oratories wherein they had sighed and prayed in the days of their distress. Even then they had adorned them to the best of their power with sculpture and painting; and not so content, had shaped out some of their subterranean chapels in the catacombs, with some pretensions to architectural proportions and decorations. This was always done over or near the tomb of some more distinguished martyr. Now these early practices had necessarily an influence upon their architectural ideas at a later period. In the first place, they led to the erection of oratories or "*memoriæ*" over the tombs of martyrs, with a profusion that exceeds belief. The two sisters, SS. Praxedes and Pudentiana, have a large

church each at Rome close to one another ; the two churches of SS. Nereus and Achilleus, and St. Cesarius, near the ancient Porta Capena, almost touch one another, and are miniature basilicas. One side of the Forum is completely made up of churches standing side by side. But besides these, they built smaller chapels, comparatively unadorned. It is not many years since such a one was discovered in excavating the ruins of Nero's Golden House, or the Baths of Titus. It consists of a plain brick oblong edifice, without aisles or pillars ; at the upper end was a plain square stone altar, and over it, painted on the wall, St. Felicitas and her seven sons, with their names inscribed. On the wall on the right hand was Daniel and another prophet, and a calendar showing the days of the week and of the month. These paintings are now nearly effaced, having been left exposed to the weather, till this early and interesting monument was covered in, last year. These small oratories and multiplied churches could not have been intended for parochial instruction, or large meetings of the faithful, but to satisfy particular devotion. They were the means of transferring to above ground, and to the light of day, the special worship or respect paid before to the martyrs' tombs in the catacombs ; and, in fact, not only were many of them built over the entrances to these venerable cemeteries, but they were furnished with a subterranean chapel, imitating their vaulted recesses wherein more distinguished tombs were placed.*

This practice of having oratories or smaller churches, to which the Christians might go according to their peculiar feelings of devotion, and in which the Eucharist was administered, as is evident from their altar, is essentially Catholic, and could not possibly be brought into accordance with Protestant belief or feelings. We can conceive no rational basis for it in their doctrines, and it certainly has no analogy in their usages. But we mention it here because a very slight modification of it produced the Catholic practice of having many chapels or subordinate oratories attached to the larger churches. In fact, the *confession*, or subterranean chapel, is a first example. The earliest instance, perhaps, of several churches grouped together, is that of the Holy Cross, built by Constantine, at Jerusalem, which, though often restored, has preserved its original ground-plan. It consists of separate chapels covering the various stages of our Saviour's passion on Calvary and Olivet, and communicating together through a common body. The Sessorian basilica, (Sta.

* Sepulchral chapels were even built in imitation of subterranean ones. See Agincourt, Pl. xv.

Croce in Gerusalemme) built by his mother, had likewise a chapel annexed, with earth from the Holy Land under its pavement. In later times, we have a remarkable example in the seven churches, now reduced to six, which are clustered together at Bologna under the name of St. Stephen's, and communicate internally together. The same may be said of the church of St. Lawrence near Rome, which is composed of two distinct churches, with a common altar between them.

Secondly, another custom religiously transferred from the catacombs to the basilicas, was that of allowing no altars save such as were martyrs' tombs. Inscriptions sometimes give the title of *ara*, or altar, to a heathen sarcophagus; the two names might be considered more truly synonymous, when applied in the Christian Church. Every altar in the catacombs is in truth a monument to some sacred hero; hence to this day the relics of some martyrs must be deposited in what is called the *sepulchrum* of every Catholic altar, at its consecration; and the centre of the altar must, in every case, be of stone. Hence in the older basilicas, and in many modern churches, the great altar is almost always in the form of a sarcophagus or sepulchral urn, and generally contains the ashes of some ancient martyr.

" But this important imitation of the humble chapels of the catacombs in the splendid basilicas of ancient Christianity, was carried even farther. In the cemetery of St. Hermes, situated without the Salarian gate of Rome, is a sarcophagus, adorned with basso-relievos, which has undoubtedly served as an altar. It is fixed, like many other such tombs, in a niche in the wall; so that its front is level with this, while a recess surmounted by an arch is sunk above it, to its own breadth. A species of apsis is thus formed over the altar, which seems to present the type of decoration ever after followed. Round the niche on the outside, is painted Our Saviour with his apostles. Within it he seems to be again represented, and below him his lambs are drinking. This is precisely what will be found represented in mosaic in the arch or apsis of the most ancient churches. But below the lambs, which represent the Church on earth, are half-figures emerging from flames, which Agincourt considers as representing the three children in the fiery furnace. But there are *four* figures in the painting; and therefore, as we do not wish to involve ourselves in controversy by asserting them to exhibit the third state of Christ's Church, the suffering in another world, we will, for the present, suppose them symbolical of the times of persecution. This part of the decoration is the only one not found in the apsis of later churches.

Having thus briefly noticed the modifications which customs

anterior to the triumph of Christianity, produced in the architectural models adopted from the heathens, we proceed to trace the greater variations which time introduced into the form given to the early churches. Theodoric, worthy of bearing the Roman name, has left us several specimens of his magnificence, in his palaces, his churches, and his tomb; and we discover in all that he built, for God or himself, the influence of his aphorism, "*Prima fronte talis dominus esse creditur, quale esse habitaculum comprobatur.*" On the whole, the churches built under him, and by his immediate successors, did not materially differ in form from those of the earlier emperors. We must, however, notice the growing prevalence of circular and polygonal churches, the models for which, as well as the architects, came probably from the east. Under the Lombard domination, from the middle of the sixth to the close of the eighth century, the first decided step took place towards the formation of more modern systems. The few churches yet remaining, said to have been erected at this era, present, in fact, an approximation to what is commonly called Gothic architecture, excepting the pointed arch, which cannot fail to strike an attentive eye. Let us take as an example the church of St. Michael at Pavia, capital of the Lombard kingdom. The leading purpose to which all other innovations may be traced, seems to be the desire of widening the arches, and thus diminishing their number. Pillars were, therefore, out of the question for their support, and consequently buttresses were introduced. Secondly, instead of having these plain, they are formed of many pillars grouped together, whereof those in front, in some instances, run up, above the cornice and the gallery above it, to the very ceiling, and pass as a band or species of groining under it to the other side; in other cases, they are divided by a capital at the cornice, and thus present two orders of pillars one above the other. The remaining columns of each cluster end at the impost of the arch, having there a sculptured capital that follows all their salient angles. Thirdly, above these arches which separate the nave from the aisles, and are of the height of the latter, there runs another series of arches, forming a triforium or gallery, such as prevails in churches of the pointed style. Fourthly, instead of a simple semicircular apsis behind the transept, such as closes the more ancient churches, we have a prolonged sanctuary or choir, ending in a semicircle, but equal to one third of the entire church in length. Fifthly, at the intersection of the cross, we have an octagonal lantern, lighted by two rows of windows. Sixthly, the windows are often composed of two or even three arched windows, joined close together, and separated from one another

by a single pillar. Seventhly, the exterior walls are supported by buttresses, which at the front are formed by clustered pillars, running to the top of the building. The doorways are arched, and composed of six or seven carved bands, receding inwards, after the manner practised in pointed architecture. In fine, to omit many other striking particulars, the entire building, exterior and interior, presents many points of resemblance to that system, in the spurious form, under which, at a later period, it was admitted into middle and southern Italy. If we simply modify the shape of the arch, we should have a perfect resemblance. Every feature which we have pointed out in this church will be found in others of the same period.

We must not, however, conceal from our readers, that Rumohr, to whose acknowledged learning, taste, and sagacity, in all that relates to Italian art, we pay all deference, considers this building, and others usually attributed to the Lombards, as having undergone material alterations in the eleventh or twelfth century.* Milliou and other writers have, no less than Agincourt, considered them as of the epoch we have assigned to this church. Rumohr, however, especially instances the buttresses in front, as yet presenting traces of having been subsequently added. The vaulted ceiling he likewise considers a later addition. Still it does not appear proved that the main features of the building are so modern. Nor if we admit the whole of Rumohr's opinion, will our reasoning be much disturbed. For if we place this church, as it now appears, in the eleventh or early in the twelfth century, it will be still older than the appearance of pointed architecture in England, and contemporary at least with the ruder system which led to its invention.

It is in either case difficult to deny, that in these churches we have a germ of that architecture which our ancestors first brought over from Italy. The communication between them and Lombardy was very frequent: and if the architecture of our earliest churches seems to indicate that Rome was the country from which it was borrowed, we can hardly conceive this intermediate character between the older basilical and the later pointed styles, to have exercised no action, as an element in the gradual transition from one to the other.

But if we find it reasonable to suppose, that this Lombard was the rude model of our own splendid ecclesiastical architecture, it certainly prepared the way and established principles for the restoration of the classical orders, as applied at the revival of art. The *great* Charlemagne (the epithet has so become a

* *Italianische Forschungen*, Berlin, 1831. 3 Th. S. 173.

part of his name that it is hardly superfluous where thus repeated) did, it is true, lead architecture some steps back towards a return to the more ancient rules. The church of the Holy Apostles, built by him at Florence, is a perfect basilica, without a transept, or a choir, but with the ancient semicircular apsis. Its aisles are separated from the nave by pillars supporting arches, and the proportions of the building are admirable; its length being exactly twice its width. Here, then, we have a proof of what we before described, the natural tendency of Italian architects, in every attempt at improvement, to go back to earlier models rather than to modify that which they possessed. The age of Charlemagne was decidedly one of great general improvement; and accordingly we find that, instead of farther departure from ancient types, by any new development of the Lombard style, it returned at once to the era of Constantine. But there is a spell upon the direction of social life, which will frustrate the completeness of any attempt to go back over its once imprinted footsteps. In spite of this change, one great feature of the Lombard architecture was still preserved; the very wide span of the arch. For instance, in the very church of which we have just spoken, there are on each side *seven* intercolumniations, in a length of about *seventy four* (Parisian) feet; whereas in the basilica of St. Paul there were, and now again are, *twenty-one* intercolumniations, in a length of *one hundred and forty-one* feet, that is, *three* times as many in about *twice* the space. In the church of Sto. Spirito, built also by Charlemagne, at Rome, we have *eight* arcades, in a length of *one hundred and twenty* feet. In this amended style, we recognize another groundwork of modern Italian architecture; but before proceeding with our remarks upon it, we must say a few words concerning the partial introduction of the pointed architecture into Italy.

It is impossible to study the specimens of this style which appeared in central Italy, without acquiring a conviction that, in every instance, it had to struggle against the impressions made by the Roman system, and that the struggle was too unequal for it ever completely to succeed. Into Sicily, where the public taste was partly prepared for it by the prevalence of Arabic monuments, it was easily introduced: but this was effected by the dominion there of Norman princes, who naturally followed what they had been accustomed to in their own country. The church of Monreale, near Palermo, the burial-place of their family, was perhaps their earliest and noblest monument. Yet, even here, the influence of the basilical style is manifest. Rome does not present one single specimen of

even tolerable pointed architecture,—certainly, at least, not beyond an occasional tomb or tabernacle. This might, perhaps, be attributed to the absence of the Popes at Avignon, during the period when it would most probably have been employed. We should rather assign the reason already given, of the counter-acting influence exercised by a previously existing style. The church of St. Flavian, near Monte-Fiascone, was erected about the middle of the thirteenth century, by Urban IV, a *Frenchman*, but is in a barbarous style, which deserves to be called neither Gothic nor Roman, for the two are frightfully jumbled together. Yet this in England was the golden era, which saw York, Salisbury, and Westminster erected. A century later, under another French Pope, the Church of Sta. Maria sopra la Minerva, was built in Rome, and presents another specimen of coarse bastard Gothic. But we may perhaps be asked, have we forgotten the splendid fronts of the cathedrals of Siena and Orvieto? By no means: for they present a strong confirmation of our theory, that the introduction of pointed architecture was irresistibly thwarted in Italy by the tendency to revive older systems. The two fronts are nearly of the same design, and both are gorgeously rich in execution. But neither presents the characteristics of pure and perfect pointed architecture. The horizontal lines strongly prevail over the perpendicular; the pediments, with their decided cornices below them, approach to Roman architecture; most of the arches are circular; the square is the prevailing figure in the centre; there are no towers, and the buttresses shooting up from the basement to the pinnacles which they bear, of equal breadth, and unbroken by a single ornament characteristic of the northern style, look rather like pilasters than anything else. Then, the moment you enter either church, all illusion vanishes; the arches are circular, the columns that support them Doric, and, excepting in the windows, little will be met to remind one of any of our cathedrals. What we have said of the fronts of these two churches applies with greater force to that of San Petronio at Bologna, designed by Terribilia.

About the time when pointed architecture might have been expected to enter Italy, that is, about the very time when these churches were erected, a revolution occurred in the sister arts, which, in our judgment, was fatal to its complete introduction. Paradox as it may appear, we allude to the revival of sculpture and painting. The Pisani, who adorned, by their marvellous carvings, the churches of Siena and Orvieto, and thus made the first gigantic step in the restoration of sculpture, wrought upon them with an eye ever turned towards the remains of classical

antiquity. Every line in their works attests this fact, were history silent: but this has recorded the very basso-relievo, a trophy of Pisan victories in Greece, from which Niccolo di Pisa caught his first inspiration. It was impossible for such an admiration and such a study of the antique, in sculpture, not to check any rising partiality towards the pointed style. For such a new direction given to taste would necessarily extend, first to the details, and from them to the greater members, of ancient architecture. In fact, whoever examines, by way of example, the beautiful representation of the *General Resurrection*, carved upon what Vasari rightly considers the master-piece of the Pisan school, the front of Orvieto Cathedral, will observe how the dead are made to rise, not from the ground, but from antique sarcophagi, the forms and decorations of which are strictly copied from classical models, and totally at variance with the style usual in the pointed manner.* To speak the truth, we should feel inclined to blame this school for having at once run into heathenism of style, by abandoning the Christian types for the classical, without allowing their art the privilege which painting enjoyed for some centuries, of being conducted upon religious principles.

But how did *this* more strictly Christian art impede the progress of an architecture, itself eminently Christian? To answer this question, we must observe that sculpture, rather than painting, is the hand-maid, or decorative attendant on pointed architecture. The basilical style presented extensive plain surfaces, within and above the apsis, round the triumphal arch, and especially over the entablature of the nave. From the earliest times these were all covered with painting, generally in its most durable, and consequently its most catholic, form—mosaic. The pointed architecture, on the contrary, abhors plain surfaces, but seeks to break every part with sculptured decorations. The ceiling, one great field of church painting, is cut up into small compartments by the groinings; the space above the arches in the nave is occupied by the triforium, and the space corresponding to them on the outer wall, as well as above the gallery, is taken up by the windows, the leading features of this architecture. It was certainly a magnificent inspiration of art that suggested the idea of employing painting, where alone it interfered not with the principles of the style, and where heathen art would have treated the project as chimerical, upon the frail glass, which seemed the substance least suited to receive it. And yet time has proved the contrary to

* See this representation engraved in Cicognara's *Storia della Scultura*, pl. xvii.

be true. However, glass was not adapted for great compositions; nor was the process of staining it equal to answering the demands of the reviving art. At the same time that the pointed style was able to penetrate into Italy, the first dawning of a brilliant era for painting was appearing. Cimabue, Giotto, Gaddi, and other patriarchs of the art, broke through the enslaving principles of the Greek school, and, feeling that the variety and richness of their art were as great as those of nature, demanded space proportioned to their conceptions of its grandeur, and sufficient for the display of its wealthy stores. Religion, ever the first to encourage every new effort of genius, and to engage it in the service of God, could not refuse so just a request. The Campo Santo at Pisa presents, indeed, a Gothic cloister; for its inner-windows and decorations are in the pointed style; but its immense range of wall, instead of being encrusted with arches, or other ornamental stone-work, was left smooth, and given up to the pencil of every artist of sufficient celebrity to be admitted to the honour of working there. The double church of Assisium, (there being one above the other,) was likewise pointed, but of the plainest kind. Immense surfaces were left, appropriated in the same manner as at Pisa, the field of excellence on which the first geniuses of the reviving pictorial art loved to exhibit their rival powers. This new love for coloured rather than sculptured decorations and representations, could not but act with hostility to the introduction of pointed architecture, such as it was then becoming in the north of Europe.

A few dates will be of service towards illustrating this matter. About the year 1200, Lincoln Cathedral was built; in 1221, Guido di Siena painted the first picture which broke through the stiff Greek method, and fixes the era of the revival of painting. In 1225, Niccolo di Pisa completed his grand sculpture on the shrine of St. Dominic at Bologna.

About 1250, Salisbury, Worcester, and Notre Dame at Paris, were built, or greatly altered. In 1240 Cimabue, in 1276 Giotto, was born; and, before the close of the century, both had begun to cover the walls of churches with frescoes, objects of universal admiration. In 1290, the cathedral of Orvieto was commenced, and eight years later that of Florence.

But the next century brought our northern style to its perfection. Its first half saw the naves of York and Westminster finished, as well as several splendid foreign cathedrals. It was only after thus brought to perfection in the north, that we could expect more southern nations to have received it, in such form as to justify comparison between the two parts of Europe.—

Accordingly, we find Portugal adopting it, by employing an Irish architect to build the splendid abbey of Batalha in 1388; and the Visconti, in northern Italy, commenced the cathedral of Milan in 1386, the very time that the groinings of Exeter were finished (1370), and Canterbury was rebuilt (1381). Now, just at that very moment, Brunelleschi was born (1377), the restorer of the basilical style, as modified under Charlemagne, and the founder of the classical manner, as used chiefly in the *cinquecento*.

During the fifteenth century, the pointed architecture continued its development in England, so as to produce the third, or richest order; Windsor Chapel being built in 1450, and Henry VIIIth's Chapel half a century later; while the tower of Strasburg was erected in 1449. In the meantime, every hope of its adoption in Italy was utterly crushed, not only by the admiration excited by Brunelleschi's designs, but by the theoretical as well as practical works of Leone Battista Alberti. The writings of Vitruvius had now been recovered, the rules of ancient art were accurately studied, and the admiration of antiquity embraced its artistic as much as its literary peculiarities. Before the last mentioned chapel had been finished, Bramante was on the stage; and the idea of rebuilding St. Peter's had been probably entertained.

From this comparative view it is sufficiently manifest, that while the pointed architecture was successively improving in the north,—and we feel justified in considering our own country as the great school wherein it was perfected,—feelings and principles were rising and taking root in Italy, highly unfavourable to its adoption there, and that these increased in force just in proportion as that advanced in beauty. No blame can attach to either side: each followed a natural course of art, imposed upon them by their historical career, by their state of social and political existence, by the genius of their races in the human family, by climate, and other irresistible and uncontrollable agents. If we be inclined to blame or pity Italy for not having caught, during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the grand spirit which superintended the erection of our minsters, she retorts by wondering, how, during the same centuries, she should have been covering the walls of churches, of porticoes, of cemeteries, and of palaces, with paintings of imperishable fame,—how comparatively petty cities should have formed schools of art, each in its own character eminent,—and that yet not a spark from this blaze of glory should have reached our northern shores; and that those ages should not, in France or England, have produced a single school, a single

artist, a single painting, worthy of commemoration. Let each country, then, be content with its own glory, and neither revile nor repine at the other's. Let each boast of having nobly followed the impulses of events, and, starting from a common point, of having reached goals different indeed, but each worthy of being accounted a noble prize. A few more words will close our sketch of Italian architecture.

We mentioned, a couple of paragraphs back, two eminent architects, contemporaries and friends, Brunelleschi and Alberti. The first of these attracted attention by a well-known portico at Florence, in which very wide arches spring from light and elegant columns. This was the death-blow of the pointed architecture in that city. Its architect attained the great point of his ambitious aims, the termination of the Florentine cathedral, the cupola of which had been left unfinished for nearly one hundred years. This he brought to a most happy conclusion; and though he sacrificed something to the semi-pointed character of the building, he here gave the great model to the unparalleled dome which crowns St. Peter's. It was, however, by the two churches of San Lorenzo and Sto. Spirito, that Brunelleschi made himself the head of the new school. In these, the arches of the nave rest upon columns, and the intercolumniations are sufficiently wide to form entrances into lateral chapels. It evidently was the convenience which this system presented for this purpose, that led, at least in part, to its adoption. The basilica of the twelve apostles, erected by Charlemagne, served, as has been already remarked, for a model to Brunelleschi. When it was built it had no side chapels; but, in course of time, these had been added, so as to correspond on each side to the openings of the arcade. It is not easy, perhaps, to decide, when this plan of flanking the church with chapels was introduced. Anastasius Bibliothecarius, if we remember rightly, informs us that St. Hilarus, successor to the Great St. Leo, added four oratories to the Baptistery of Constantine, dedicated to the Holy Cross, and to SS. John Baptist, John the Evangelist, and Stephen, probably the same which still remain. We have already seen how the ancient Christians erected detached chapels to different saints, and how they united several churches together. It was natural enough, as the number increased of those to whom veneration and worship was to be shown, to unite the *memories* or chapels in this manner, so as to open into a common church, the high altar of which should be reserved for more solemn worship. This laudable practice, once introduced, necessarily modified the form of the church, and gained a preference for that adaptation of the classical architecture, which allowed the

side chapels to appear connected with the church, by being visible from its middle or principal part. This could not be the case when the columns were kept close, as the ancient architectural proportions required. It would have been unreasonably presumptuous in an architect to decline from those forms which the discipline of the Church that employed him rendered necessary for its worship; or to expect its established usages to bend to his professional rules. Hence Brunelleschi, among more ancient Christian models, chose that one which experience had already proved best lent itself to the worship of the Church, as modified in the course of ages. The measurements of his parts, however, the forms of his architectural members, and even of his mouldings, were taken from the antique; and thus he combined classical taste with a proper attention to fitness and convenience. He laid the foundation of a style peculiarly prevalent at Florence, and to some extent in Rome, during the sixteenth century; the history of which is so closely connected with that of sculpture, that it must not be enlarged on in this place.

The new style introduced by this great architect, however much admired, was by no means incapable of still farther improvement. It was considered desirable to remove the eye-sore to the classical observer, of columns supporting anything but an entablature; but it was by no means desirable to do this with any sacrifice of the convenience obtained by Brunelleschi's method. L. B. Alberti, in his famous church of St. Andrew, at Mantua, gave the model on which St. Peter's, and almost every other great modern church in Italy, has been constructed. It consists in a nave separated from the sides, whether they are formed of aisles or only of chapels, by means of arches, having their own imposts, with buttresses between them, on which are half-columns or else pilasters, that support an unbroken entablature running over the arches. We do not think it difficult to discover whence Alberti drew this idea: that is, from the ancient amphitheatres, or still more probably from the triumphal arches. In the former, serieses of open arches have an entablature that runs round the entire building, supported by half columns placed against every buttress. In the triumphal arches, there are either half columns, as in that of Titus, or detached pillars, as in that of Septimius Severus. Now it is evident that Alberti, when called to finish the superb church begun by the Malatestas, at Rimini, chose, as the model for its front, the triumphal arch still existing in that city. From his church at Mantua, we may date the commencement of the style ever since prevailing in Italy, but which reached its perfection in the wonderful Vatican basilica. And if Brunelleschi copied the reformed architecture introduced by

Charlemagne, Alberti may be said to have restored, with incalculable improvements, the forms employed by the Lombard school. Michelangiolo, the greatest of his followers, however indebted to antiquity, and however partial to its unrivalled monuments, had too much genius to follow their system blindly, without fitting things to their real purposes. Both in sculpture and in architecture he took care, without ever losing sight of antiquity, to be original and modern. No one ever felt as he did the superior dignity of Christian over pagan art; and the necessity of satisfying, by the former, wants and aspirations which the latter could never feel.

Here we may close our sketchy history of sacred architecture in Italy; from which it will appear that it has its links so closely woven together, that, without a breach of continuity, a *fault*, as geologists call it, in the natural course of social progress, no other system could have been introduced; so that the great churches of modern times are the legitimate and undegenerated descendants of the earliest Christian edifices. In all this we have no doubt but we possess Mr. Pugin's suffrage; for his favourite architecture would well deserve to be styled *Gothic*, if it suggested the overthrow of every other system, however venerable, and however adapted to times and places. *A propos* of this name,—which Rumohr, with no small degree of plausibility, attributes to Vasari,* who actually confounds the *Gothic* architecture under Theodoric, with the pointed style,—we must observe, that while we agree in banishing the vulgar name, given in ignorance and continued in derision, we feel the want of a substitute for it. The term *pointed architecture*, now usually prefixed, is far from satisfactory; for it will not apply, as an epithet, to the parts of architecture. We can say a *Grecian* column, base, or capital; but we should feel it awkward to speak of a *pointed* pillar, or a *pointed* cornice. Might not the term *Northern*, as giving locality to the origin and prevalence of the style, be well adapted to distinguish the system from those which we usually designate by their countries, as Roman, Grecian, Egyptian, or Etruscan?

So far are we from considering Mr. Pugin as harsh or severe upon Protestant art (if there be such a thing) in England, that we think he might have added much to his censure. For instance, if the extinction of all good pointed architecture amongst us be clearly imputable to the change of religion, the accusation will have double weight if we look at the abominations erected as tombs, under Elizabeth and James I, in Westminster Abbey and

* Page 169.

elsewhere, and intended for Grecian architecture, with sculpture that would have disgraced the most barbarous period of the middle ages; and consider that these arts were in their perfection in other parts of Europe. But the religion adopted by England was not only, in its nature, hostile to their progress, but proved an effectual bar to their introduction by foreign artists. For while it was a matter of drawing, hanging, and quartering, to deny the king's supremacy, or to worship the saints, there was not much chance of Italian artists, who received liberal encouragement in France and Spain, crossing the seas to teach or practise the arts, at the risk of either their faith or their necks. We are not, indeed, acquainted with a single great inspiration of the sublime or the beautiful in art, for which the world is indebted to Protestantism. Even St. Paul's, avowed copy as it is, betrays its incapacity to conceive a great original thought. The system of arches separating the nave from the aisles was retained, as we have seen, from the necessity or propriety of giving entrance to lateral chapels; in St. Paul's there are no chapels, and the rules of classical architecture have been departed from, without a plea of fitness to excuse it. The dome in St. Peter's is raised over the high altar; it is a sublime canopy to that great concentrating object; it raises the eyes and thoughts to heaven, when kneeling beneath it: what meaning has that of the London cathedral? It is situated out of the precincts devoted to worship, it overshadows nothing holier than the statues of Dr. Johnson and Mr. Howard, perhaps the tomb of its architect*; and we believe it more celebrated from containing a whispering gallery, which may be visited for a shilling, than from any religious impression that it makes!

One concluding word of advice to Catholics. Let them profit by Mr. Pugin's book. Let them ever remember that good taste is a prerogative of their religion, that the arts are its handmaids, and that they will have to make a reckoning with posterity. We cannot be expected to compete with our forefathers in splendour of dimension or of decoration; but we may imitate them in good taste. Let no individual follow his own caprices in buildings consecrated to God, and belonging to his religion.

* St. Peter's is the tomb of the apostles: an inscription in St. Paul's tells us that it is the tomb of Sir C. Wren! This inscription, which occupies the most prominent situation in the church, is often instanced as bordering upon sublimity: to us it is at least profane, and in miserable taste. Of the greatest ancient Christian works the architect is unknown: neither Bramante nor Michelangiolo has left his name recorded anywhere in St. Peter's; wherever any such records appear in ancient churches, as at Pisa, they are either outside the church, or placed on the cornice, or some other place where they can least attract notice.

Let us have nothing that can be mistaken for a dissenter's meeting-house on one side, nor for a profane building on the other; but let all our churches be so constructed, that no Catholic may pass them without an act of reverence, and no Protestant without a look of admiration.

ART. V.—*Histoire de Sainte Elizabeth de Hongrie, Duchesse de Thuringe*. (1207-1231.) Par Le Comte de Montalembert, Pair de France. Paris. 1836.

IN perusing the various works which come under our hand, in our duty as reviewers, our feelings must vary according to their character. We speak not at present of such as stir up indignant and unpleasant emotions: the volume before us banishes the thought of all such from our minds. But, in turning over pages of more agreeable nature, sometimes we may be astonished at the erudition displayed by the writer—sometimes we may rather admire his sagacity and genius; some books may convey to us a high opinion of his moral qualities, and others make us long for his acquaintance as a man of amiable and virtuous character. Seldom, however, has it been our lot to experience the peculiar feelings which have accompanied the perusal of the work now on our table: feelings more akin to jealousy than to any other we have described. It was not the research, nor the rich poetical genius, nor the deep religious tone, nor the eloquent language of its youthful author, conspicuous and admirable as all these qualities are, which rivetted our attention, or secured our sympathy,—it was the sincere love, the enthusiastic devotion, with which his task has been undertaken and accomplished, that has made us, so to speak, envy him the days and the years which he has spent upon its performance. So pure must have been the heart and soul while occupied with the sainted object of their spiritual affections; so closed must the feelings have been against the rude materialities of life in this sear generation, while inhaling the healthy freshness of a greener age; so full of delicious meditation, of varied hope, and of conscious success, must his pilgrimage have been, as he strayed from town to town, in thoughtful simple-hearted Germany, to cull traditions yet living in the memories of the people, or discover mouldy records in its libraries; in fine, so full of content and peace must life have seemed, while thus passed, in spite of many a trial which needed strong consolation, that gladly would we exchange

many of our barren years for but a few so joyfully and yet so usefully spent.

But we are forgetting, that as yet we have presented neither our author nor his book to the reader, beyond the mere ceremony of announcing their names at the head of our article; and we have been writing as though we believed him possessed of the same happiness as ourselves, of personal acquaintance with both. The best account we can give of the writer, will be our notice of his work; for his character is imprinted on every page. A few brief preliminaries will therefore suffice. The Count de Montalembert is not a visionary, who has centred his studies and meditations upon by-gone ages, to the neglect of duties required by the present. As a peer of France he has been found at his post, once indeed, in earlier days, at its bar, to plead the rights of Christian education against the barbarous monopoly of a semi-infidel university; and since, in his place, to unite the applause of all parties at his noble and eloquent vindication of ecclesiastical rights, outraged in the person of the Archbishop of Paris. Versed, and even fluent, in almost every language of civilized Europe; connected with our own country as well as with France by ties of blood; with Belgium by more recent domestic bonds; with Italy and Germany by repeated visits, during which he has imbibed from the one the spirit of Christian art, from the other that of Christian philosophy; with Poland by an enthusiastic admiration of its struggle for liberty against its tyrant, as well as a rare acquaintance with its literature; he is not as one asleep, nor as one walking in dreams amidst his generation, but is as able to understand its wants and their remedies, as any who will perhaps consider that time lost for public purposes, which is not spent in planning rail-roads, or discussing the budget. In England, it will be probably imagined by many, that a peer who could think of writing a saint's life must be a bigot and a Bourbonist, to say no worse. Now M. De Montalembert is neither: he attaches not the happiness of his country to the augury of a name; he advocates the cause of rational liberty under the government that actually exists;—because he considers true liberty as based upon a religious, a Catholic principle, which should predominate under every form of government, and is the unalienable right of every Christian people. But let him speak for himself, at the conclusion of his beautiful introduction, of which we shall say no more just now.

“It would give us pain, were it to be thought, in consequence of what we have said, that we are blind enthusiasts for the middle ages, that we consider them in every respect admirable, enviable, and blame-

less, and fancy that, in the age wherein we live, the nations may not be healed as heretofore.* Far from us the wish to pine away in useless regret, and to wear out our eyes, weeping over the tomb of nations whose inheritors we are. Far from us the vain thought of bringing back times which have for ever fled. We know that the Son of God died upon the cross to save mankind, not during five or six centuries, but for the world's entire duration.... We regret not, therefore, however we may admire, any human institutions which have flourished, according to the lot of every thing that is human; but we bitterly regret, the soul, the divine spirit, which animated them, and which is no longer to be found in the institutions that have replaced them. It is not then a barren contemplation of the past, it is not a contempt nor a cowardly abandonment of the present, that we recommend: once more we say, away from us such miserable thoughts. But as the exile, banished from his hearth for his fidelity to the laws of heaven, will often direct his affectionate thoughts towards those who have loved him, and who await him in his native land; as the soldier, fighting upon distant shores, is warined by the account of battles which his forefathers have there gained; so be it allowed to us, whom our faith makes us in some sort exiles in the midst of modern society, to raise our hearts and our looks towards the blessed inhabitants of our celestial fatherland, and, humble soldiers in the cause which hath glorified them, to inflame our hearts with the recital of their combats and their victories."—p. cx.

* * *

"Such are the thoughts which have inspired us while writing the life of Elizabeth of Hungary, who loved much and suffered much, but in whom religion purified every affection, and comforted every grief. To our brethren in the faith we present this book, alien, both by its subject and its form, from the spirit of 'the times in which we live.' But the simplicity, the humility, and the charity, whereof we would recount the marvels, are, like the God that inspires them, above all claims of time or place. May this our labour only bear into some souls, simple or sorrowing, a reflection of those sweet emotions which we, in writing it, have experienced; may it rise towards the throne of God, as a weak and timid spark from that ancient Catholic flame which is not yet extinguished in all hearts."—p. cxv.

These extracts will serve more than all we can say, towards disabusing any of our readers of a preventive surmise, that the author of such a work as this must be a mere dreamer, who steals from active life into the seclusion of his study, or affects a blind partiality for systems of no practical utility. And here let us indulge in a remark, that will appear almost profane in such a place, that there is more visionary inutility in the modern schemes of *industrial* materialism, in the plans for civilizing and bettering the condition of men in their lowest scale, according to the views of the age, than in all the desires of good and

* *Sanabiles fecit omnes nationes terræ*, sap. i. 14.

learned men to rekindle enthusiasm for the spirit of the middle ages, and even to revive its usages. The Lanark nonsense, and the Saint-Simonian madness, which pretend to improve mankind by the fuller working out of the utilitarian principles now in vogue, are more dreams than any of these, and, what is worse, are only *ægri somnia*, the delirious ravings of sickly phantasies, and disordered brains. But to return.

We owe the present work to one of those happy combinations of circumstances, which convince the individual that is their subject, of a benevolent Providence watching over his good. Our author arrived at Marburg one 19th of November, and proceeded to examine its church, the first in which the pure pointed architecture was adopted in Germany. Though now in Lutheran hands, it was open on this day, but its only occupants were some children who played among its tombs. Such were the marks of honour that distinguished the festival of its patron saint, Elizabeth ! He saw her mutilated statue upon one of the pillars of the church ; he diligently studied the rich traces of early painting and carving upon its desecrated altars, representing the principal events of her life ; he visited the silver shrine, now neglected in the sacristy, wherein her sacred ashes reposed, till the sacrilegious barbarity of the Reformation, in the person of one of her own descendants, tore them thence, and scattered them to the winds. Around it, he observed the stones worn hollow by the knees of pilgrims ; and, having kissed these monuments of ancient piety, he resumed his thoughtful way. The image of "the dear St. Elizabeth," as she has ever been called in Germany by the people and by her biographers, and as throughout his work he has loved to call her, hovered as a sweet vision round him on his journey ; he sought for records of her life, among the living as among the dead ; he went as a palmer from place to place, which heretofore she had glorified by her virtues in life, and sought in the collections of ancient documents all that her age had left on record concerning her virtues. The result of his researches occupy this volume.

Few distinguished persons of any age have found more numerous or more affectionate biographers than St. Elizabeth of Hungary. The list of authorities quoted by De Montalembert, consists of thirty-eight printed, and fourteen manuscript works.* Yet, many known to have once existed, have been mislaid or destroyed. Of the writings thus enumerated, a considerable proportion were by contemporaries of our saint ; some contain

* One of these, the MS. collection prepared by the Bollandists, contained itself fourteen different documents.

the juridical depositions of her individual and inseparable companions. Of the later authors, a considerable proportion are Protestants. From the two sermons of Happel, a Lutheran curate (1645), entitled "*Diva Elisabetha magnifice coronata*," to the third volume of Von Raumer's great historical work on the house of Hohenstaufen, religious prejudice has not been permitted to alloy the pure enthusiastic affection which the name of Elizabeth has ever excited through all Germany. But her new biographer would not content himself with the study of these sources; he naturally felt how necessary and how interesting it was, for a proper appreciation of her character, to view her in connexion with the age in which she lived, and of whose spirit she so powerfully partook. For this purpose, he ranged through the history, the literature, and arts of her age; and, anxious that his readers should see the admirable qualities of his heroine through the same medium, he has judiciously prefixed to her life, in the form of an introduction, a summary review of the period in which she flourished. This part of the work, we must, at the risk of great injustice to its merits, present compendiously to the reader's notice.

From the title of the work, it will be seen that the period occupied by its history, is a brief portion of the first half of the thirteenth century (1207-1231); a period of time, to the general conception of history-readers, wrapped up in the veil of darkness, usually known under the name of "the middle ages," associated in their minds with some vague ideas about ignorance and superstition, both of which, if they have any connexion with the period, find it only in their proper seat, such a reader's own mind. For, in truth, the thirteenth century is one of the most important, and most interesting in the annals of Christian Europe.

The latter portion of the preceding century had greatly belied the promises of its commencement; the influence of St. Bernard and the immortal Hildebrand, had well-nigh been neutralized by the triumphs which brute force had subsequently gained over the spiritual power of religion, justice, and genius, in Europe and in Palestine. But just at the close of the ill-omened century, the chair of Peter became occupied by one whose soul, talents, and energy, were equal to the crisis, and turned the infant energies of a new era to the purposes of good. Innocent III must not be as slightly touched on as our present theme would alone justify; his full and just biography by Hurter, a Protestant clergyman, will claim our future and detailed attention. Suffice it here to say, that not one great or good quality seems to have been wanting to make up his character. As a

poet, the two unrivalled hymns, *Stabat Mater* and *Veni Sancte Spiritus*, must sufficiently stamp his reputation; as a statesman, his complicated and successful efforts for the welfare of every country in Europe, must ensure his reputation; a man above every temptation of ambition, he is declared by the fact of his bitterest enemies leaving him sole guardian of their infant heirs; as a pontiff, his zeal and success, in restoring several nations to religious unity, attest his worth; while his powerful genius appears most conspicuously in the influence exercised by his principles and actions upon his worthy successors in the Apostolic See.

The civil state was no less distinguished by great and beneficial actions in favour of humanity. The Imperial House did not, indeed, come up to its great destinies; but under its shadow there grew an illustrious scion, the root of a mighty race, that Rodolph of Hapsburg, born in 1218, who, at his coronation, when the sceptre could not be found, took the crucifix from the altar, and holding it aloft, exclaimed:—"Behold my sceptre; I wish for none other." The two great codes of German, and of purely Christian, legislation, the Mirrors of Saxony and Swabia, belong to this period, when the great cities rose into importance, and almost every principality could boast of some great name among its rulers. Of France, it is sufficient to say, that it was governed successively by Philip Augustus, and the greatest of modern kings, St. Louis; of England, that to this period we owe Magna Charta, and our first parliament; of Spain, that it counted among its sovereigns James, the Conqueror of Valentia; Alfonso, founder of the University of Salamanca, the hero of the great day of the "Navas de Tolosa," which broke the Moorish power; and St. Ferdinand the Catholic, the liberator of his country by the conquest of Seville. Every other lesser part of Europe was equally indebted to this epoch for some signal step in its progress towards regeneration.

In the spiritual life, this century was even more remarkable. The foundation of the two great religious orders, of St. Francis and St. Dominic, is enough to give an indelible character of glory to the age. These two patriarchs, of whom Dante writes—

L'un fu tutto serafico in ardore,
L'altro per sapienza in terra fue
Di cherubica luce uno splendore,

*Paradis. XI.**

not only trained up two schools of saints, both among their

* The one was as a seraph in his love,
The other was, in wisdom, upon earth
A brightness caught from cherubs' light above.

rigorous followers, and among their disciples in the world, (of whom St. Elizabeth was one) but discharged a mission of peace and good-will among the hardy nations of Europe; caused poverty, which they sanctified, to be respected; and justice, which they ever advocated, to be dealt to the oppressed. They raised up learned doctors, who left no corner of science unexplored; who, like Vincent of Beauvais, composed entire encyclopædias of human and divine learning; or like Albertus Magnus, and the angelic St. Thomas, confuted every error, and unravelled all the mazes of philosophical doubt; or, like Roger Bacon, fathomed the mysteries of nature, and revealed her hidden laws; or, in fine, like St. Bonaventura, chose the better part of meditating, in most heavenly mood, at the feet of Christ, and of his Blessed Mother.

The portion of introduction which unfolds the spiritual riches of the age of St. Elizabeth, will not bear abridgment; it is itself too rapid a sketch to be farther reduced, and the attempt would, moreover, strip it of that warm colouring, that living glow of enthusiasm, with which it is so richly tinted. Never were so many great examples of virtue and piety, in every rank of life, collected in one period of the Church, as adorn this century; and if our author has selected one as his *cynosure*, by which to direct his course through its historical perplexities, he has left a rich store of others, scarcely less bright, to reward the affectionate researches of any kindred mind.

Of the ardour with which every branch of sacred literature was pursued during this period, we have already cited several instances, and plenty more might be added. Profane learning—if any such could be said to exist in an age when religion guided every pen—had began to rise from its ashes; and the science of legislation, in particular, reached a high degree of perfection in the many codes which date from this period. For the history of art during it, we must refer our readers to another article in this Number,* in which we have, imperfectly enough, spoken somewhat of the glorious cathedrals which northern Europe saw arise during the thirteenth century, and of the impulse which the sister arts of painting and sculpture received in Italy, from the schools of Pisa, Siena, and Florence. This, perhaps, is the honour of the age which is most generally known;—for who has not heard of Cimabue, Giotto, and Niccolo Pisano? But the poetry of that period, at least out of Italy, is but little spoken of. Yet France probably produced more truly poetical performances then, than it has done since. The Count De

* On Mr. Pugin's "Contrasts."

Montalembert very judiciously excludes the Provençal school, which, by its licentiousness, and almost heathenish profaneness, may be said to have received a taint from its proximity to the Manicheism of the Albigenses and other such heretics; but he remarks that among the religious poets—epic, lyrical, elegiac, satirical, and even dramatic, compositions, were in use as much as in the age of Louis XIV.

“Upwards of two hundred poets,” he writes, “whose works yet remain, flourished in that century; perhaps the day will come when Catholics will think it worth while to seek in their works some of the most delightful productions of the Christian muse; instead of imagining, with Boileau, that poetry began in France only with Malherbe.”—p. lxxv.

To Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, Europe owes its first modern drama, as well as England her Great Charter;—a double glory not easily to be rivalled. The subject of his poem was the Redemption of Man. Germany, however, has been more just than any other country to the reputation of its early bards, who adorned this century. Its *Minnesänger* or troubadours, headed, in genius, by Walther von Vogelweide, have their proper place in its literature; the great epic, the *Nibelungen Lied*, is read by youths at school. But the history of *St. Elizabeth* is intimately connected with that of German poetry. At the moment of her birth in Hungary, seven of the most celebrated poets of Germany, including the afore-named Walther, and the no less famous Wolfram von Eschenbach, were assembled at the court of her future father-in-law, in the castle of Wartburg, contending for the palm of the “joyous science,” in a series of compositions known by the name of the poetic War of Wartburg, (*Der Singerkriege uf Wartburg*) and published by Ettmüller in 1830. Klingsohr, sent for as umpire in the contest, which had defied the judgment of less refined auditors, announced her birth, and foretold that she should marry the heir of the royal house of Thuringia.

Here we might be expected to enter upon the body of our book, having been naturally brought to the birth of its heroine. But for this purpose we should be obliged to pass over upwards of twenty pages, to us the most delightful in the volume. The history of poetry in the thirteenth century—the age of Dante—could not be complete without embracing Italy. But even its first half, of which De Montalembert chiefly treats, before the divine poet was born, was far from barren of successful cultivators of the sacred muse. He himself mentions his great predecessors; but it is a curious fact that the first to whose poems no date can be assigned, is that most wonderful saint of the period—*St. Francis of Assisium*. We are not surprised to see

our youthful author yielding himself up, on the mention of his name, to the flow of religious enthusiasm, which it must excite in any bosom that contains a heart capable of rightly estimating his superhuman virtues. Our author admirably characterizes that age in a few words, when he tells us, it may be considered as the age of St. Francis and St. Louis. But the influence of the latter was comparatively limited to the country which he governed in righteousness and truth, while that of "the Seraph of Assissium" extended to entire Europe. He was the first man who laid a foundation in modern society for the importance of the people; he made, as we have already remarked, poverty glorious, and a lowly condition enviable; for while, on the one hand, his virtues attracted towards him and his, the veneration of the great,—the daughters of kings, and the noblest knights, were among the first to enrol themselves in his secular institute. As during life he was the regenerator of popular poetry, so after death he became the favourite theme of art, and his tomb was its earliest sanctuary. The wonderful union in him of childlike simplicity and noblest sentiment, of a sympathetic affection for nature and all it contains, and the highest soarings after heavenly things that man was ever admitted to since the apostolic age, forms a character wherein all the perfections of the earlier Church seem to have mingled with the germs of the new state into which society had entered, giving them a moral energy, they never else so powerfully possessed.

It will not then seem wonderful that St. Elizabeth, though living in Germany, should have felt the influence of his character,—should have joined her age in its universal admiration of his privileged holiness, and should have been the first to introduce his order into her own country. Many points of resemblance may easily be traced between the characters of both; but there is one on which many may be tempted to doubt our prudence if we speak much. It is not the simplicity of heart, for which both were equally remarkable, nor their absolute love of poverty, nor any other such rare virtue, to which we allude: but to the wonderful or miraculous events which all contemporary historians have described in their lives. Upon this matter we think it better to introduce M. De Montalembert's own words, because they record the convictions of one who has deeply studied the monuments of that age, and who, not being anonymous as we are, cannot excite the unjust suspicion that he would not have courage openly to avow his sentiments. Thus he writes towards the close of his Introduction.

"We are aware, that to put forth such a biography as this, in its complete form, we must be prepared to meet with a class of facts and

of ideas, which the unsettled religions of modern times have long since marked with reprobation, and which a sincere but timid piety has too often excluded from religious history; we allude to those supernatural phenomena which are so frequent in the lives of the saints, which faith has consecrated by the name of miracles, and worldly wisdom branded with that of legends, popular superstitions, and fabulous traditions. Of such events there are many in the life of Elizabeth. We have been as scrupulously exact in recounting them as in every other portion of her history. The very thought of omitting, palliating, or interpreting them with skilful moderation would have shocked us. It would have been in our eyes a sacrilege, to suppress what we believe as true, out of deference to the haughty reason of our age: it would have been a culpable want of accuracy, for these miracles are recorded by the same authorities as the other events which we narrate, and we should not have known what rule to follow in admitting their veracity in one case and denying it in others. In fine, it would have been an act of hypocrisy; for we avow without shrinking that we believe with the strongest good faith, the most miraculous occurrences which have been recorded of God's saints, and of St. Elizabeth in particular. It has not even cost us any sacrifice of our feeble reason, to attain this conviction; for nothing appears to us more reasonable and more natural in a christian, than that he should bow with gratitude before the mercies of his Lord, when he sees them suspend or modify those natural laws which they enacted, to secure and glorify the triumph of much higher laws in the moral and religious order. Is it not soothing and easy to conceive how souls, tempered as was Elizabeth's, and her contemporaries, elevated by faith and humility above the cold reasonings of earth, purified by every sacrifice and every virtue, living habitually, as though by anticipation, in heaven, presented a field ever ready for the operations of God's goodness: and how the faith of the people, ardent and simple, claimed, and in a manner justified, the frequent and familiar interposition of that Almighty power, which the senseless pride of our days, by denying, repels!"—p. 104.

Long as this quotation may be, we have in reality stopped short in the opening of a truly eloquent and feeling passage, which we would gladly have given at length. We have selected this portion, on account of the moral courage which it displays, and which is as requisite in France as in England for making such an avowal. We are rejoiced to see it; and we unhesitatingly say, that the life of St. Elizabeth would have been but as a moral tale, rich indeed in every display of virtue, but devoid of its most pathetic and consoling incidents; barren of that sublime interest, which the close communion of a soul, the simplest and purest, with heaven, must excite, had a cowardly respect for a scoffing or a doubting age induced our author to suppress a series of facts attested as strongly as any in history can be. We regret no less the necessity we are under of passing over several

other delightful pages, which treat of the honour paid to God's saints in those ages of simple faith. The rich source of practical thought which the virtues of His Blessed Mother in particular afforded; the influence, bland and salutary, which her devotion exerted upon society and character; the many forms in which this feeling blended with the love of nature, or the chivalry of life, illustrated as they are by the learning, published and manuscript, of the age, form a theme on which our author expatiates in a fervent strain, that does equal honour to his scholarship and to his heart.

Sensible that we have discharged our duty so inadequately towards the introduction of this valuable work, we feel no small discouragement at the idea of undertaking to analyse the biography itself. Indeed, we at once declare our inability to do any thing like justice to it. To condense is impossible, without stripping the life of its beauty of detail, and to extract is difficult where every chapter has its own peculiar charm. We propose, therefore, to ourselves no higher aim than to rouse the curiosity of the religious reader to a perusal of the entire work; and, if possible, to induce some one among them to translate the entire book into our language, as it has already been translated into German and Italian.

The life of St. Elizabeth is remarkable from exhibiting the purest perfection of Catholic virtue in every extreme of life, in the princess and the beggar: and all within the short duration, from birth to death, of twenty-four years. Daughter of the King of Hungary, she was asked in marriage for his son, by Hermann, Duke of Thuringia and Hesse, when she was only four years old. Her father, having acceded to his request, delivered her into the hands of the Duke's ambassadors with valuable presents; and she was conducted to the ducal castle of Wartburg, above the city of Eisenach, to be brought up in the company of her future husband Louis, who was a few years older than herself. They grew up like brother and sister, by which names they continued to call one another even after their happy marriage. Her early piety, and contempt of all pomp, drew upon her the ill-will of the court; and every effort was made, after the death of Duke Hermann, to induce Louis to send her home, and seek another match more suitable to his dignity. But the youthful prince had learnt to know and value her virtues, for his own life had been spotless from infancy, and proof against every temptation purposely thrown in his way. They were married when she was but thirteen, and led a life of wedded affection such as the world has seldom witnessed. In 1227 Louis took the cross; and after a farewell, the particulars

of which must move the dullest feelings, joined the Emperor in Italy, with the flower of German chivalry, whereof he was considered the brightest ornament. He was seized at Otranto with a fever, and died with such edifying piety, as to have received the honours of a saint.

During this first period of St. Elizabeth's life, one is at a loss which most to admire, the infantine simplicity of her character, or the regal magnificence of her charity. As to the first, although she joined in all the festive and splendid scenes of her court, although her gaiety and cheerfulness were the life of her board, she seems never to have been conscious either of her high rank, or of her superior qualities. As a wife, devoted with unbounded affection to one who as religiously returned her love, she wore the diadem and the embroidered robe simply because his station required it, and it made her pleasing in his eyes. So little did she seem to know the value of these splendid baubles, that if, on returning home from some public occasion in royal array, she found her purse exhausted, and the poor not all relieved, an embroidered glove, or a jewelled bracelet, or even her mantle of state, was given away, as applicable to no better use than to lighten their distress. And hence, when her husband went too far from home to bear her in his company, she instantly put on a widow's unadorned apparel, and wore it till his return. She always delighted in the company of the lowly and wretched; and when she had on such occasions of separation clothed herself in the dress which this class of persons generally wore, she would exclaim, in a spirit of foresight, if not of prophecy, "thus shall I walk, when I shall be poor and miserable for the love of my God." But on this quality of her character we must let her biographer be heard.

"We willingly acknowledge, that in the life of this saint, which we have studied with so much affection, no trait has appeared to us so moving, so worthy of admiration and envy, as this infantine simplicity, which may raise on some lips a disdainful smile. To our eyes, this guileless giving way to every impulse, her frequent smiles and tears, her girlish joys and uneasinesses, the innocent playfulness of her soul while reposing on the bosom of her heavenly Father, mingled as all these qualities were with such painful sacrifices, such serious thought, such a fervent piety, and a charity so devoted, so active, and so ardent, form a most charming and distinguished trait. But more particularly in an age like this, whereof the flowers are all withered, without their having first ripened into fruit, when all simplicity of character is extinct in the heart, and in domestic as much as in social and public life, no christian can study without emotion and without envy, how this quality developed and displayed itself in the soul of our Elizabeth, whose short life was no more than a prolonged and heavenly childhood,—an

unceasing obedience to the words of Our Saviour; when taking a little child and placing it in the midst of his disciples, he said, "Unless ye become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven."—p. 63.

Of the extraordinary, or, as some would call it now-a-days, extravagant charity of St. Elizabeth, we have given an instance just now. This was in her an indefatigable virtue, and as varied in its manifestations as are the forms of human misery. She founded hospitals where she could serve the sick with her own royal hands; she refused food and alms to none that came to ask them; and she daily trod the rugged path from her castle to the city, to seek out such as were too feeble to ascend it. She stripped herself of her jewels, and again and again she cleared out her wardrobe, till she had no dress befitting her rank, or in which to meet visitors of her own condition. To understand, or even to justify this charitable prodigality, it must be observed, that her virtuous husband allowed her full liberty to dispose of what she pleased in this manner, and never murmured when he saw her apparently squandering her own and his possessions. A remarkable instance of this mutual good understanding occurred in 1226. The Duke was summoned to Italy by the Emperor, to assist him in his wars, and left his large estates under her government. He had scarcely departed, when a frightful famine invaded all Germany, and Thuringia in particular. The Duchess applied to the relief of the poor all the money in the treasury, amounting to 64,000 gold florins, an enormous sum in those days, which had been amassed by the sale of certain domains. In vain did the officers of state remonstrate and oppose her generosity; when the treasury was emptied, she opened the royal granaries, in which was corn valued at the price of two of the largest ducal castles and several cities. All this was most prudently distributed, so, that nine hundred poor received their daily sustenance at the castle. Twice a-day, the Duchess descended to the city to minister to the infirm; and she opened two new hospitals for their use. When the harvest drew near, she assembled all the poor; gave to each a sickle, a dress, and some money, and sent them to work in the fields. In a few months the Duke returned, to the great joy of all his people, and was met at some distance by his chief officers, who thought to avert his anger, by accusing his wife of having, in spite of their strong opposition, dissipated his treasure and emptied his stores. "His only answer was, 'Is my dear wife well? That is all I wish to know; what matters all the rest.' He then added, 'I wish you to allow my dear Elizabeth to give as much alms as she likes, and to assist, rather than contradict her. Let her give

all she pleases for the love of God, provided she only leaves me Eisenach, Wartburg, and Naumburg. God will restore all the rest whenever it pleaseth him; alms will never bring us to ruin.' Then he hastened to meet his dear Elizabeth; when she saw him, her joy knew no bounds—she threw herself into his arms, and kissed him a thousand times with heart and mouth. And while they thus embraced, he said to her, 'My dear sister, how have thy poor fared during this hard season?' To which she meekly answered, 'I have given unto God that which his was; and he hath kept for us what was thine and mine.'—p. 115.

If credit can be given to the unanimous testimony of contemporary writers, supported not only by the assent of Protestant historians, but by the tradition of the Lutheran population, Louis had reason, indeed, to allow full scope to her boundless charity. One of the beautiful histories, thus cherished in the faithful memory of the people, is the occurrence, often quoted in pious writers, of her husband surprising her as she descended the hill to the town, laden with provisions for the poor, and playfully insisting upon seeing what she bore in the gathered folds of her robe, when, to his amazement, the more so as it was the depth of winter, he found it filled with beautiful roses.

The reader may judge how much we have fallen short of the interest which this portion of our Saint's life possesses, when we inform him, that we have condensed, in these few paragraphs, what occupies one hundred and fifty pages, of large and close-printed, octavo, in the work before us. Arrived at the second period of her life, which begins with her husband's death, her biographer warns the few readers, who, his modesty supposes will have followed him through his work, that from that moment, they will find in her annals no attractions proceeding from human interest; that all the romantic features of her previous history vanish; and instead of the youthful princess, serving God in simplicity of heart, amidst the allurements of a dangerous station, they must expect to see a penitent, versed in all the rigours of an ascetic life, and treading the less singular, but rougher path of ordinary Christian perfection.

Following the advice of evil counsellors, her brothers-in-law seized on the supreme command, in detriment of the rights of Louis's children, and ordered his widow to depart with them at a moment's warning, and without any preparation, from the castle. At the same time, severe penalties were proclaimed in the city, against any one who should harbour her. She descended the hill in tears, bearing in her arms an infant, born since her husband's demise, while her other three children were led by her faithful maids of honour, whose depositions, after her death,

form the principal source of her biography. It was the depth of winter, yet every door in Eisenach was shut against her; of the thousands who had been relieved by her bounty, not one was found sufficiently generous to brave the inhuman decree pronounced by her relations. She at length took refuge in the shed of a public inn, appropriated to the swine, and supported herself by spinning, while her heart was engaged in prayer, and her soul daily purified from every terrene affection. During this period, she attained that sublime height of contemplative perfection, which has seldom been granted but to the poor and humble, and which forms a theme too holy to be touched on in this place.

The family of the princess could not long be kept in ignorance of her forlorn situation, and her uncle, the Bishop of Bamberg, gave her an asylum in the castle of Botenstein. Here she continued to spend her time in every practice of virtue, devotion, and charity, till summoned to Bamberg, by an important event. Her husband, before his death, had exacted a promise from his noblest followers, that, their crusade ended, they would bear his mortal remains to his own country, there to be buried among his dear monks at Reinhartsbrünn. After two years, they returned from Palestine, and passing by Otranto, disinterred his bones—placed them in a rich shrine, and bore them in solemn procession to Bamberg. There the afflicted widow met them, and gave vent to her last burst of human feeling. But the faithful knights, having learnt her wrongs, swore to revenge them; and immediately after the funeral obsequies of her husband, obliged her brothers-in-law, now ashamed of their unnatural conduct, to restore her to her station. The town of Marburg, with its territory, was assigned to her. Here she built herself a cottage, adjoining an hospital which she had founded; took the habit of St. Francis, with whom she had corresponded shortly before his death, and spent two heavenly years, divided between active charity, and divine contemplation. Her death, which was worthy of her life, and the details of which, as given by M. De Montalembert, in the simple language of the old chroniclers, are beautiful and most affecting, was soon followed by universal veneration. Her brother Conrad, after several years spent in frightful crimes, became a sincere penitent—entered the Teutonic order, of which he was soon the brightest ornament, and dedicated his abilities to founding the canonization of her, whom living, he had so grossly outraged. He lived long enough to commence the great Church of Marburg in her honour; the first, as we have before remarked, in the pointed style of Germany. We will not fatigue our readers with an account of the beautiful ceremony of St. Elizabeth's disinterment or translation,

at which upwards of a million of pilgrims attended from all parts of Europe, when her body was borne by Archbishops, assisted by the Emperor Frederic, who, taking the diadem from his brows, placed it upon hers—for the body was entire—saying, “As I could not crown her as my empress when living, I will crown her this day, as a queen immortal in the kingdom of God.”* Still less are we willing to disgust them, by the account which Lutheran writers have given us of the desecration of her shrine, by her descendant, the Landgrave Philip, whom Protestants surname “*the generous* ;” the same worthy to whom Dr. Martin Luther gave leave to have two wives. It is revolting and horrifying to the last degree, and shows, in its proper light, the character of one among the princes that honoured the Reformation, by their protection, and by their early adoption of its principles.

The sketch which we have given of this interesting and edifying biography, will suffice to show it possessed of, perhaps, stronger contrasts of situation, and a nobler scope for display of character, than any work of fiction would easily venture to invent. The spectacle of one, a duchess to-day, and an outcast to-morrow, a rich princess in the morning, and a beggar before night, seems scarcely within the reach of historical possibility, even in our days of revolutionary dethronements. But the sublime dignity of Catholic virtue which the sudden change calls into play, and the sterling value which the transition stamps upon the conduct of the better days, are such as have belonged, and yet belong, in various degrees, to the characteristics of our holy religion. Every Catholic must read this life—a type of many others which have been led within his Church—with feelings of pride and of gratitude; and what is more important, with improvement to his best and most valuable feelings. It affords lessons of instruction for the rich, and of consolation for the poor: it presents models for the religious contemplative, and for him who moves amidst the active occupations of life: it contains admirable rules of conduct for the single, the married, and the widowed: it exhibits beautiful examples of justice and condescension for a sovereign on the throne, as of resignation and noble independence for the lowest orders of society.

Historical parallels are an interesting pursuit, and our present number has already exhibited one between two chancellors of England; we feel almost tempted to institute a similar one between our Queen Elizabeth, and the saint who three centuries earlier bore her name. In perusing the life before us, we have

* This alludes to the offer of marriage made her by the Emperor, after her husband's death; an offer which, like several others, she firmly refused.

been involuntarily forced to contrast the two :—the one gracious and meek, the other haughty and overbearing ; the one simple and artless as a child, the other crafty and deceitful ; the one bountiful and charitable, the other griping and avaricious ; the one forgiving the grossest injuries with a smile, the other persecuting her favourites to death for a suspicion ; the one radiant in beauty, yet heedless of her charms, and casting her rich apparel to the poor, the other affecting artificial youth amidst wrinkles, and draining her courtiers' purses for presents of finery, and even commoner garments ;* the one faultless, as a virgin and as a wife, the other endeavouring to steer an unsafe course between the reputation of maidenhood, and the lubricity of scandalous amours ; the one, at the early age of twenty, ready to exchange her coronet for the humble cord of St. Francis, and riches for begging "for dear Jesus' sake," and expiring with joy at twenty-four, the other, withered in body and mind, after a life of seventy prosperous years, and a reign of forty-five, unable to make up her mind to leave the world, or even to speak of a successor : yet the first is but as one among many Catholic sovereigns and princesses of her own age ; her aunt St. Hedwige of Poland, her daughter Sophia of Hesse, her nieces St. Cunegonda and St. Margaret of Hungary, her sister-in-law, B. Salome, her grand-niece and namesake, St. Elizabeth of Portugal, her contemporary and admirer, Blanche of Castille, the mother of St. Louis ; while the other stands alone—the paragon of Protestant queens ! The *Post* lately informed us that in August last, at a meeting held at Worcester to congratulate our young and gracious sovereign, the Lord Bishop of the city related the following anecdote :—

"About eight or nine years ago, the Duchess of Kent had requested the Bishop of London and the Bishop of Lincoln to come to Kensington for the purpose of examining into the proficiency of the youthful princess in her education. One of the right reverend prelates, observing that the princess had been lately reading the History of England, said to her, 'Pray tell me what opinion you have formed of Queen Elizabeth.' The princess, with the modesty and timid deference belonging to her character, answered, 'I think that Queen Elizabeth was a very great queen, but I am not quite so sure she was so good a woman.' " (Great applause.)

We are rather tempted to doubt, whether, on putting the question, the right reverend interrogator anticipated the second clause in the answer ; for it looks to us as if intended to elicit some display of sectarian feeling, perhaps some sentiment which could lead to a proposal of her as a model of the Pro-

testant queen. If so, all was baffled by the upright sense and heart of the young princess, who, we are glad to see, had so early learnt to prize moral, above regal greatness. We trust too, though the anecdote does not state it, that the right reverend interrogator proceeded to say, that some mistake lurked in the wise and virtuous reply, and reminded his royal pupil that no sovereign deserved to be called great, who was not good. If, indeed, after the exposures of modern historical research, there still hang an ideal charm about the royal name "Elizabeth," we are sure that it would be sooner converted into a real one, in her who should copy, so far as circumstances permit, the mild and amiable virtues of the German princess, than in any who should chuse as a pattern the murderess of Mary Stuart. The blood of *our* St. Elizabeth has flowed into every noble line of Germany, till we believe it has now reached our throne: may similar virtues attend the proud descent!

ART. VI.—1. *The Angler in Ireland, or an Englishman's Ramble through Connaught and Munster, in the Summer of 1833.* London, 1834.

2. *Journey throughout Ireland, in the Spring, Summer, and Autumn of 1834.* By H. D. Inglis, Esq. London, 1835.

3. *A Tour round Ireland in the Summer of 1835.* By John Barrow, Jun. Esq. London, 1836.

THE anomalous spectacle Ireland presents to the eye of a stranger, attracts the attention of even the most superficial tourist. They are surprised to observe as fertile a soil as Europe can boast of, and a country with one-fourth of its population in a state of pauperism; millions of acres of uncultivated land, and hundreds of thousands of able yet unemployed labourers: splendid barracks, capacious prisons, and crowded hospitals. In short, a land teeming with plenty, and a half-starved people!

Some ingenious theorists attribute these, and every other evil incident to human nature, to "Popery." Yet on looking abroad, they find, unfortunately for their theory, that wherever the same cause exists, it produces a diametrically opposite effect, for in many of those states where the Catholic religion prevails, the people are happy, orderly, and industrious; nor do those countries where sovereigns happen to profess a different faith

from the majority of their subjects, form exceptions. Ireland is now in a state of transition, emerging from the paralyzing effect of centuries of misrule, penal laws, and local oppression. Emancipation and reform, though tardily and reluctantly extorted, are beginning to exercise their beneficial influences, and gradually rescuing the Irish people from absolute despair. At length they hail the blessings of education, which an enlightened government has extended to the rising generation, as a first step towards reconstructing the shattered frame-work of society.

The grievances of Ireland are so numerous, and of such long standing, that she has been metaphorically designated, "a hydra who is perpetually tearing herself." The most influential organ of the party which has so long inflicted on her all the horrors of Orange-Tory despotism, draws the following too true picture of the result of their own barbarous policy.

"In Ireland alone is to be found a population abandoned to the mercy of the elements of chance, or rather of the legal owners of the soil, who are protected by an armed police, and a strong military garrison, in the exaction of unheard-of pecuniary rents, from a destitute tenantry—rents which are only paid by the exportation of the great bulk of the food raised in the country, leaving those who grow it, a bare subsistence on a diet of potatoes, eked out by weeds.

"There rests not so foul a blot, we fearlessly assert, on the character of any other government; the wretchedness of the mass of the people has no parallel on the face of the globe in any nation, savage or civilized; a population of eight millions left to live or die, as it may happen. How has man prevented the obvious intention of God—to provide every comfort of life for all! One-third of the rich soil lies yet uncultivated, the rest but half-tilled by a dispirited, starved, naked, beggarly, and discontented people; the bulk of the produce of whose industry, such as it is, is swept off to other lands, to be sold for the exclusive benefit of men, whom the law invests with the unconditional ownership of this fair portion of God's earth, and with the power, if they so choose, of absolutely starving all its inhabitants.

"And this law, we wisely expect this unhappy population to cherish, venerate, and *implicitly obey*. Shame, shame, we repeat, on that state which shall be the last to recognise the claim of the orphan, the widow, the sick, and the aged, on the charity of their wealthy neighbours."—*Quarterly Review*, Dec. 1835.

It is not in our power to use any stronger language to express our abhorrence of the iron despotism, which "a miserable monopolizing minority" has hitherto exercised over unhappy Ireland, than that just quoted from the leading journal of the faction, who can hypocritically affect to lament the deplorable effect of *one* of their own sins of omission, viz. the non-introduction of poor-laws. During their long tenure of office, they have brought

a fine country to the brink of ruin, and degraded a brave, generous, and intelligent people, leaving to their successors the task of rescuing their victims from so many evils.

An obvious query, now that this accumulated misery is recognized, is, why resist the application of salutary remedies in order to remove it? Such as a settlement of the tithe question, a modified system of poor-laws, and a reform of corporation abuses. "The Church is in danger," is the answer; will the danger be diminished by leaving the tottering fabric of an Established Church, as the *only obstacle* to the reform of every existing abuse?

The church militant has an auxiliary in the House of Lords; they have hitherto made common cause, and succeeded so far, in stifling every attempt to legislate for Ireland on liberal principles. Oppressors are seldom at a loss for a pretext; their last resource being the tyrant's plea—necessity.

In the Island of St. Domingo, the French asserted that the negroes were a degraded race, because of their colour, and because "their facial angle was too acute for intellect." Acting on this principle, they endeavoured "to keep the negroes down;" but the result was, that the French were soon driven out of the Island, and the despised blacks formed a republic, which subsists to this day! A word to the wise.

Mr. Jefferson, the American President and slave-owner, tried to palliate republican slavery, on the ground that the slave population were a distinct race, "aliens" forsooth. A certain factious opponent of the Queen's government, a countryman of this same Jefferson, alleges on pretty nearly the like pretext, that the Irish nation is not entitled to free institutions, and equal rights with the English. It remains to be seen if any British peer will be bold enough to persevere in the same hazardous course in the next Session of Parliament, when no longer secretly abetted by the Court, in opposition to the wishes of a majority of the people, constitutionally expressed, as we doubt not they will be, through their representatives.

Time is the greatest of innovators: the oftener the points at issue with regard to Ireland are discussed, the more apparent the just rights of that deeply injured nation become, and the inevitable necessity of their accomplishment, solely by intellectual means, without any intermixture of physical force, displayed by the force of truth, aided by the resistless weapons of powerful eloquence, in and out of Parliament. One master-mind, the champion of his oppressed country, an unshackled press, and peaceful organization, are the overwhelming political engines constitutionally called into action.

"The world," says another highly-gifted Irishman, "beholds the

anomalous spectacle, that has ever since the reign of Henry II been presented by the two nations. The one subjected without being subdued; the other, rulers but not masters. The one doomed to all that is monstrous in independance, without its freedom; the other, indued with every attribute of despotism, without its power."—*Moore's History of Ireland*.

Local oppression and the tithe system were the origin of all the disturbances in Ireland during the last century, from the first White-boy insurrection in 1759, down to the Rockites and Ribbonmen of the present time.

At the period of the accession of William IV, several of the most extensive and populous counties were under the Insurrection Act, and now, not a single barony has been proclaimed for the last two years! The Tories, without ever attempting to *strike at the root of the evil*, contented themselves with passing bills to put down the insurrection, and any temporary expedient to put off the evil day.

The *Quarterly Review* disingenuously conceals the master grievance of Ireland, merely the "*suppressio veri*," as to the greatest of all anomalies—a Protestant Church in a Catholic country, and that unfortunately the poorest country, notwithstanding the fertility of its soil, almost in Europe; yet it possesses the richest Church establishment, with the smallest congregation attached to it, in proportion to the entire population, extant. The *Quarterly Review* is a high-church zealot, and zealots are all formed of the same materials, whatever be their party. The three works before us, are written by zealous Protestants, two of them orthodox members of the Anglican Church, yet they cannot adduce a solitary fact, in the whole course of their progress throughout the Island, tending to prove that the "Church" has been in any way conducive to the peace, the happiness, or the prosperity of the country; on the contrary, it is impossible to deny the melancholy evidence presented on every side, demonstrating that it has been a fertile source of expenditure, and almost unmitigated evil, by the profanation of God's name to the purposes of bigotry and faction.

The "Angler," (an English clergyman, we understand) has generally a happy way of expressing his meaning, and is tolerably free from prejudice, lamenting however, with amusing gravity, the fact, "that unfortunately the Roman Catholic religion is that of a vast majority of the Irish people." He does not confine his remarks to aquatic sports, (though those who are fond of such, will také a peculiar interest in his ramble to the west of Ireland, which affords abundant scope for that pleasing recreation;) graphic descriptions of the less frequented parts of Gal-

way and Kerry, particularly the wild district of Connemara, and the romantic barony of Iveragh, diversify his amusing volumes.

Differing as all these travellers do in most other respects, they agree in acknowledging the proverbial hospitality of the Irish, but are sorely afflicted with a malady, well known on the British side of the Channel—the O'Connell-phobia: whilst they render an involuntary homage to the transcendent talents, and well-merited popularity of the illustrious patriot, they dread the power of the "great agitator" for good or evil.

Though these gentlemen traversed the country before that happy epoch, when the mild yet firm government of Lord Mulgrave, made disturbed districts and proclaimed baronies obsolete terms, they travelled with perfect safety to purse and person, at all hours of the day and night. Such is the discriminating faculty of the people, that "the stranger" was always privileged, even where the laws were set at defiance against the local oppressor.

Much as a rapacious oligarchy has done to degrade the Irish peasantry, no national character has obtained more general eulogy from intelligent travellers of all ranks, than they have. Mr. Bicheno, writing some years ago, says,

"The Irish peasant is now what he was in the days of Swift—scantily clad, wretchedly housed, miserably fed, and grievously rack-rented."

Prince Puckler Muskau, in his entertaining Tour, sums up their character in the following words:—

"The Irish people, taken in a body, with all their wildness, unite the frank honesty and poetical temper of the Germans; the vivacity and quickness of the French, and the pliability, naturalness and submission of the Italians. It may, with the fullest justice be said of them, that their faults are to be ascribed to others; their virtues to themselves."

Count Montalembert, speaking of their piety and attachment to their clergy, says,

"Each brings, at Christmas and Easter, the small means which his economy has saved, for the support of the priest and the temple of the Lord. All give in proportion to their means, and with a good will."

To these beautiful tributes to the excellent qualities of the Irish peasant, we may add, that amidst all his wretchedness, unequalled perhaps at any time in any part of the habitable globe, he preserves a degree of patience, and even cheerfulness, such as we rarely notice in more favoured lands.

Mr. Barrow, Junior, is one of those holiday tourists, who, from the habit of writing in some public office in London for

ten months of the year, cannot even suffer his pen to rest during the other two, intended for relaxation. No sooner on board a steam-boat, than, seized with the scribbling mania, they set to work with such assiduity, that the common result of a few weeks' excursion is a goodly octavo, wherein, through the medium of Mr. Murray, of Albemarle Street, they "bestow their tediousness" on the reading public. It is not, therefore, surprising that Mr. Barrow's book—like those of the whole genus he belongs to—affords innumerable proofs of the mighty imperfect knowledge he contrived to pick up during his "Tour round Ireland, in the Summer of 1835." Professing to eschew politics and religion, a pretty strong Tory bias pervades most of his remarks; mixing exclusively with one party, it was not to be expected that he could give either a correct or impartial account of a country of which he took so superficial a glance, or of a people, whose present unhappy state is mainly attributable to the oppression of that very party.

Notwithstanding the disclaimer touching religion, Mr. Barrow artfully slips in not a few prosing pages on the interdicted topic, contributed, however, by a lady, a pious member no doubt of the "Hibernian Auxiliary branch Missionary Society for the Conversion of the benighted Catholics." A most prejudiced account of the Rev. Mr. Nagle's new reformation expedition to Achil island on the coast of Mayo, is the theme, whose absurdity is amply apparent, from internal evidence, to render it nugatory, even if the learned and venerable Dr. M'Hale had not condescended to refute it by stating the real facts, in reply to the calumnies with which pseudo-saints assailed him. The dulness of Mr. Barrow's book is in some measure redeemed by its embellishments, which are a few amusing sketches by that clever artist Maclise: we shall dismiss it without farther notice. Indeed, the only novelty it contains is a discovery made by its ingenious author at Curraghmore, the seat of the Marquis of Waterford, that his lordship, "though a little wild, is, like all the Beresfords, kind and good-hearted!" This is surely ironical. The noble Marquis has hitherto obtained only an unenviable degree of notoriety for "kindness" in the police reports at home and abroad. As to the archbishops, bishops, and beneficed clergymen, who rejoice in that patronymic, their goodness of heart consists in "kindly relieving" Ireland every year of the entire produce of upwards of a hundred thousand acres of its best land; and we have yet to learn, if any portion of what these clerical Beresfords have so long been receiving from the Church, has ever, through the media of hospitals, schools, or charitable institutions of any description, devolved to the use or benefit of

the public. Field-Marshal Lord Beresford displayed a singular proof of "goodness of heart," by ejecting his poor Catholic tenants in Carlow who voted for the liberal candidate, to die of cold and hunger on the high road, on the principle (from Scripture, of course) that "a man has a right to do what he likes with his own!" Another Beresford, a Dublin alderman, in days of yore, used to administer rather *striking* proofs of the "tenderness of his heart" to the citizens of Dublin. The most recent instance of this family good quality was evinced by the Rev. William Beresford, of swan-shot notoriety, during the "dragonades" of Lord Haddington's disastrous, but fortunately ephemeral government: this climax of "kindness" and Christian charity consisted in shedding innocent blood to collect the hateful tribute of tithes from a famishing peasantry. And is it a matter of astonishment that cool calculating Englishmen decline to insure the lives of Irish parsons of this stamp?—yet such is the forbearance of the patient people of Ireland, that any office might open policies with perfect safety, even on the lives of those fanatical itinerants—the O'Sullivans and M'Ghees, who have travelled all over the three kingdoms, as the hired libellers of their own countrymen.

Mr. Inglis's work is one of higher pretensions than either of the other two we have mentioned. Favorably known as a popular traveller, he is often quoted, and perhaps more weight has been attached to his opinions than they deserve. This gentleman devoted much attention (considering the limited stay he made anywhere) to the actual state of that most interesting class of society, the peasantry—investigating with praiseworthy industry the rate of wages and labour, the value of provisions, and the complicated relation between landlord and tenant, with their various subdivisions of middle-men, under-tenants, and cotters. Rents, tithes, rates, and burdens of every description, which clog the machine of rural economy, attracted his observation, eliciting many shrewd remarks, and some useful suggestions. The result of these enquiries enabled him to anticipate, as he says, the Poor Law Commissioners' report, but as that elaborate document and the report of Mr. Nicholls, are long since before the public, and a system of poor laws for Ireland is likely speedily to be carried into effect, we are precluded the necessity of adverting to a subject already fully discussed in our pages.

We understand that there is recently established at Limerick (where much misery exists) a *Mont-de-Piété* on the model of that of Paris;—were every large town in Ireland provided with such an institution, it would be the means of furnishing part of

a fund necessary for the support of their pauper population under the projected poor law system. Thus the scheme would be productive of benefit to the public, in alleviating the burden of the poor, levied on the necessities of the very poor themselves. The beneficial effects of the Limerick Mont-de-Piété, though only five months in operation, are already perceptible: the profits arising from it were intended to defray the expenditure of Barrington's Hospital, but as that munificent institution is now by act of Parliament made the public hospital of the city of Limerick, and provided for from other sources, a considerable fund may be rendered available from the Mont-de-Piété; it borrows money at six per cent, and lends it on pledges at twenty per cent per annum, or four-pence in the pound monthly, which is lower than the pawnbrokers' rate of interest, and no charge is made for tickets; 20,000 have already been issued, three-fourths of them for articles under five shillings value. The sum at present (September) invested is about £5,000, but it is calculated that £20,000 may be employed, which will produce a clear yearly benefit of nearly £3,000 to the public.

Mr. Inglis's book having passed through several editions, and been published upwards of two years, its merits are now well known, and we shall not, therefore, give any extracts from it. In spite of his religious prejudices, which are generally acknowledged and pretty strongly evinced in his tour in Ireland, as well as its precursor, "*Spain*," and occasional defects of a less serious nature, we regret that this is the last work we shall have from the lively and entertaining pen of its amiable author, whose wanderings in "*many lands*" we have perused, if not always with profit, certainly with pleasure.

An eminent statesman, lately addressing his constituents, (the most numerous in the empire) said:—"If an Established Church is valuable because it provides for the religious wants of the poor, the Church of Ireland does exactly the reverse of this; it provides for the rich only, and compels the poor to pay for both." The Irish branch of the Church of England was established there on two grounds: one religious, the other political. To make proselytes from the Catholic population, and to strengthen "*the Protestant interest*," cementing by means of a common Church Establishment the bond of union between England and Ireland, was the language held by its advocates. How far either of these objects has been attained, a very short reference to official documents will suffice to show. By a return made to the Irish House of Lords, in the year 1734, the population of Catholics to Protestants then in Ireland was just two to one; half a century later, (1788) the population (4,040,000

according to G. P. Bush) was about double the previous numbers; the increase, in spite of penal laws not long repealed, was wholly on the part of the Catholics, the Protestant population remaining stationary: and a few years (in 1805) after the Union, Newenham estimated the population at 5,395,000, when the proportion of Catholics to Protestants had augmented four to one, only one half of the latter belonging to the Established Church; and the increase of Catholics has continued in the same progressive ratio to the present day. Having failed in a religious point of view in "propagating the faith," we believe no man will have the hardihood to deny, that as a political institution, the Irish Church, so far from having produced any beneficial effect, has degraded Ireland, and brought shame upon the English name. Yet this is the fulcrum on which the Tories have placed a lever of national bigotry, in order to raise themselves by means of it into power, and the disaffected Orange party once more to the sweets of office.

The anomalous position of the Anglo-Irish clergy, brings them in constant collision with the people—their flocks, as they facetiously term them—and places them in hostility to the government, whose measures, so far from aiding, they are most actively engaged in opposing. Thus the Sovereign, who has the disposal of bishopricks and superior benefices, finds her ministers thwarted, and the benevolent intentions of the legislature for tranquillising the country, counteracted, by those very men who are indebted to the crown for their preferments.

Such is the result of the abortive experiment of a political Church, with its tithes, pluralities, and abuses; forming in every respect an antithesis to the "Church of the people," whose stability depends on *its* poverty, and on *their* piety: its ministers are rising in public estimation, whilst those of the law-Church are sinking by their own rapacity, incurring much odium, and getting little money, by an endeavour to extract, like clerical alchemists, wealth out of the baser metals of human suffering, by legal and military processes.

Nor are the tithe-payers more pleased with the part they play: we speak not now of the natural and conscientious repugnance of Catholic proprietors and tenants to the tribute; but we can state as a fact, familiar to those who reside in Ireland, that the Protestant landowners are actually the most energetic opponents of what is called "a settlement of the tithe question," *unless by a total abolition of tithes.*

The objection of the Protestant landlords to tithes (always excepting lay impropiators) is not that the per centage proposed to be deducted is too much or too little, nor to the appropriation

clause, about which they do not care one straw ; nor to the tax out of the livings for moral and religious instruction ; it is because the bill does not go far enough, that is, *to the annihilation of tithes in name, and in nature*, in order that they may hold their land free from any church burden whatsoever, which they allege is just so much deducted from the rent. In the valedictory address of a defeated candidate at the recent election for an Irish county, he complains that three hundred Conservative Protestant landlords refused him their votes, yet he is a staunch Conservative, and whilst in Parliament always opposed the ministerial tithe bill !

The chief argument in favour of the tithe system, is that it *is* the law of the land ; but the law is an unjust one, and ought to be repealed, which repeal, the present generation, it cannot be doubted, will witness. We are not going to discuss here so complicated a question, blended as it is with so many conflicting interests, but we have no doubt that if tithes were abolished, provision might be made by the state to secure to the Established clergy their respective benefices, (a life interest in which is all they can claim) and even some compensation to lay-impropriators for their *valid* rights.

The mass of property bequeathed by the piety of Catholic benefactors of former ages, and confirmed by the legislature since the change of religion in England, (for in Ireland no such general change ever took place) now possessed by the Established Church, has been sometimes overrated. According to Parliamentary returns, the glebe lands are 82,645 acres, worth at least £2 an acre, and no doubt yield more. By a report of the Commons, on ecclesiastical revenue in Ireland, dated March 1833, the bishops' lands were 485,532 acres, not comprising 184,000 acres of unprofitable land ; making the grand total of Church land amount to about 750,000 statute acres, three-fourths of which are the best land, situated in the most fertile districts of the respective dioceses. The income derived from these (exclusive of glebe land) is, by the official returns, only £151,127. 12s. 4d., though chiefly arable, and worth at least one to two pounds an acre to the lessees ; but owing to the mode of leasing bishops' lands and levying fines, it is extremely difficult to estimate their real value. Thirty years ago, the fertile land in Ireland, (exclusive of 4,800,000 acres of waste land) was computed at 13,454,000 statute acres : supposing all the cultivated land subject to tithe to be only eight millions of plantation (Irish) acres, it would yield in money tithes, at eighteen-pence per acre, on the same principle as those parishes already brought under the composition act, £668,000 a-year ;

and this enormous sum, besides the 750,000 acres of land above stated, is allotted for the cure of 852,000 souls, the actual number belonging to the Established Church. The prelates have also the patronage (as a provision for their families and friends) of 921 benefices and superior dignities, out of the 1280 benefices comprised in the 2,500 parishes of Ireland; many are formed into unions, detrimental to the Church, and far from beneficial to the people. The richest archbishop in France has £1,000 a-year; the poorest bishop in Ireland £4,000!—the richest French bishop has *less* than the poorest Irish rector (£400 a-year)! The annual expense of the Church of Prussia is £300,000, for a population of 13,566,000; and that of the kingdom of the Netherlands, before its separation from Catholic Belgium, (population 6,000,000 of inhabitants) was only £252,000 a-year, for Catholic and Protestant clergy of both. The annual revenue and cost of the Kirk of Scotland, according to a writer in the “*Edinburgh Catholic Magazine*” for December, 1832, do not exceed £338,000, the Scottish people being chiefly Protestant as is well known, and this for a population of 2,500,000, one half of whom are comprised within the pale of the Established (Presbyterian) Church, which has 928 parishes and about a hundred chapels of ease. Let the expense of these several Churches, at home and abroad, be compared by any disinterested and impartial individual, keeping in mind that Ireland is one of the poorest countries in Europe, and its Church is about the richest—that nine-tenths of the population do not belong to that Church; and then enquire if a people can be contented where religion is made a matter of revenue, which can seldom be collected without resorting to legal violence, often attended with the shedding of human blood?

The worst enemies of the stability of the Irish Church—a mere political establishment—are those who resist the reform of its inveterate abuses. No institution, civil or religious, which is not rooted in the affections of the people, nor calculated to benefit the community at large, can ever be constructed on a firm and lasting basis: and when the sacred name of religion is prostituted to serve the purposes of a faction, to maintain a system of monopoly, and to engender hatred and prejudice between the professors of different creeds, even the pretext of “the Church” being a connecting link between England and Ireland, will not avail the opponents of every amelioration relating to the latter country: their “ingenious devices” are detected, and the people of Ireland—long a proscribed race in the land of their birth—now that they *know* their rights, will no longer submit to persecution and contumely, for the sake of upholding the unholy fabric.

The Catholic hierarchy and clergy neither ask, nor would they consent to receive, government stipends in any shape, as dependants on the state; they demand no *regium donum* like the Presbyterian ministers of Ulster, nor a share of the wealth possessed by the Established clergy, having publicly and solemnly disclaimed any such intentions: they prefer the voluntary system, trusting for their support, and the decent maintenance of the Church under their charge, to the piety and attachment of their flocks, like the pastors of the primitive Christian Church, who diffused its holy influence unaided by tithes, collected, as in Ireland, at the point of the bayonet!

The exemplary Catholic priesthood, though they derive no emolument from the state, have, like the laity of that Church, ever been distinguished for loyalty, and firm attachment to the monarchical principle, as well as to the faith they derived from their ancestors; submitting to proscription and forfeitures, by the republican party under Cromwell, for their adherence to the unfortunate Stuarts; and even during the darkest epoch of modern Irish history, (1798) scarcely a Catholic of note was engaged in that sanguinary struggle.

We were incorrect in saying that the Catholic clergy received *nothing* from the state; there is a yearly parliamentary grant of £9,000 for Maynooth College—just enough to put them under a seeming obligation, most certainly not worth incurring for so paltry a sum, when compared to the importance of the object for which it is intended—the education of the priesthood of nine-tenths of the people of Ireland; being less than the one hundredth part of the amount annually appropriated to the support of the clergy of the Protestant part—that is, the remaining tenth of the population of the country.* Yet twelve Tories were found in the House of Commons hardy enough to object to this insignificant pittance, on the pitiful pretext of conscientious scruples, forgetting that, on the same principle, were Catholics to resort to religious cant, they would refuse contributing to support a double Church as repugnant to *their* conscience.

The abolition of parish cess (church rates) in Ireland, was a boon of considerable importance. The establishment of an efficient police was another of still greater value, particularly since it has been weeded of Orangemen and all members of secret societies. This corps is so well composed, so admirably organized and disciplined, that it has now become a strictly constitutional force, and by no means unpopular;—this is saying much for any police, which at best can only be considered in the

* See Dublin Review, No. III.

light of a necessary evil, often resulting from distempered times. We have no hesitation in saying, that the Irish constabulary might serve as a model for a rural police, so much wanted in England. Ireland is also indebted to the present ministry for the reform of the grand jury (Act 6th and 7th William IV). The appointment of county surveyors, and the stop put to "jobbing," which the grand jurors were accused of in their fiscal capacity, and the application of the public money granted to employ the poor, and the discharge of arrears of rent due by their own tenants; these were boons of paramount importance to every Irish county, besides the general amelioration of the whole system which has arisen from the new act. The landlord still contrives to keep the unfortunate tenant in his power, by exacting a rent he knows it is quite impossible for the latter to pay, thus compelling him to vote as he chooses, under pain of ejection, i. e. ruin; availing himself of every improvement that raises the value of his property from the industry of the occupier; but the expenditure of local taxation (as exemplified by the evidence of the late Mr. Nimmo,) can no longer be appropriated exclusively for the profit of the landlord.

"The universal principle throughout Ireland, by which roads are made under the grand jury presentments, is this: the labourer makes the road, and is allowed the value as an offset against his rent by the landlord—not always the head landlord, but the immediate landlord—who receives the money from the county treasurer.

"I conceive this abuse arises from the circumstance, that the money raised by an assessment of the whole county, may be applied exclusively to those places where interest, or, as it is called, *jobbing*, on the grand jury, permits it being disposed of."*

Query, Was the money actually laid out in the way most convenient to the landlords' demesne? At all events, it generally found its way into his pocket.

It is a pleasing evidence of returning prosperity, well known to every one conversant with Irish affairs, to observe, that *rents are now better paid* than they have been for many years past in Ireland.

It is not necessary to seek for political or religious causes, though neither were wanting, to account for that restless disposition and insubordination which has unhappily so long characterized the Irish peasantry. Local oppression is the bane of Ireland; the despotism of petty tyrants, who exercised a summary power over their unfortunate tenants, and ground them

* Mr. Nimmo's evidence before a Committee of the House of Lords, 1824.

down to the dust, has hitherto been the discreditable system of government; unequal laws, administered by Orange magistrates (lay and clerical), reduced a hardy, active, intelligent people, to the miserable condition of mere serfs.

“Drain’d by *tithes* of his store,
Punish’d next for being poor,—
This is the poor wretch’s lot
Born within the straw-roofed cot.”

This picture of the Irish peasant is drawn by the graphic pen of Robert Southey, Poet Laureate, author of the “Book of the Church:” *we* have only substituted the word “tithes” for “taxes.” Mr. Nimmo, whom we have already quoted, says,—“The Irish landlord has greater power than in any state I know,—he is not bound to protect the tenant in case of distress or starvation, as he is in England or Livonia, where they cultivate the land by predial slaves, or even as the owners of negro slaves in the West Indies are.”

During the long period of Tory misrule, when the country was governed by a monopolizing faction, to whom alone was confined the administration of unjust laws, neither life nor property were secure; and such was the misery every where prevalent, that the (greatly enlarged) jails were filled with *mendicant* criminals, in order that they might at least have food and lodging, which their own wretched hovels did not afford: and it is a well-authenticated fact, that, in Dublin, 20,000 persons died in one year of absolute want, whilst abundance of food was being exported to England for the benefit of absentee landlords, and 60,000 patients (one-fourth of the whole population of the capital) passed through the fever hospitals in the year 1826, a vast proportion of whom were afflicted, not with sickness, but—hunger!

In Ireland, unlike every other country, there scarcely exists any community of interest between landlord and tenant, though in bitter irony they are called “their benefactors;”—assuredly no other relation is recognized between the one and the other than that of buyer and seller, in mercantile language; the proprietor looks upon his land as so much merchandise, from which the highest rate of profit must be extracted, and in order to do so, the tenant is kept in a state of villainage like the vassal of a feudal baron to his superior. The natural connexion subsisting between landlord and tenant is never cemented by that friendly intercourse so necessary in a moral and political point of view, and which generally prevails all over England and Scotland—where the landlord builds houses and farm-steadings

for the accommodation of the cultivator of his land; but in miserable Ireland, he finds nothing but the ground. There is, in fact, just the same degree of sympathy between the parties, as if the one were a tradesman and the other his customer. It is a mistaken notion to suppose, that when an English landlord remits part of his rent in consequence of a bad harvest, the concession is looked upon by him, or accepted by his tenant, as an act of charity, which it would be deemed 'in Ireland—the spontaneous gift of an individual of a rare genus, liberal landlords—for in England such deductions are so very common, under particular exigencies, that the farmer regards them almost as a matter of prescriptive right.

The most praiseworthy attempt that has been made by a liberal government, to counteract the manifold evils under which Ireland has been suffering, was to disseminate the blessing of education among the lower orders, through the means of national schools. In Sir Henry Parnell's evidence, he states, that a very few years ago, eleven counties were without a single bookseller's shop; literature is still at a very low ebb in many of the provincial towns, which are chiefly dependant on itinerant book-venders for their supply. The means of education are offered to the whole population of the country by the national system, now in full vigour, which has received the stamp of almost universal approbation, a few unworthy cavillers in either house of parliament forming the exception; alleging, what they ought to know is false, that it is anti-scriptural. And if a despicable minority persist in refusing permission to those under their control, to take the advantage of sound instruction, on their head be the guilt they commit against the laws of God and man. We need not pass any eulogium on a system which has already been the means of preventing crime, and of improving the moral and religious habits of the rising generation: the report of the Education Committee will, we are convinced, bear us out in the assertion, that the national schools of Ireland have been productive of "the greatest benefit to the greatest number."

A still more pitiful ground of objection, is, that some of the schools under the new Board of Education are near chapels, and others in nunneries. We see no reason why the *vicinity* of a Catholic chapel should prove injurious to the scholars of any creed; moreover, no particular faith is inculcated, the system being founded on principles precisely the reverse of exclusive; and if benevolent females, who devote their lives to the purposes of religious exercises, and the education of youth, are willing to instruct poor children—though Catholics—gratuitously, we may say, (for what object can a few pounds, and some books, received

from the National Board, be to an institution where four hundred pupils are taught)—let them, in God's name, go on and prosper, "with no reward but the consciousness of spending their lives in an humble endeavour to do good:"—such are the words of a Scotch Protestant, who visited Ireland last autumn, and published his remarks in that cheap and useful periodical, *Chambers's Edinburgh Journal*, from which we make the following extract on the subject of tuition by nuns:—

"In the course of our ramble through the streets of Tralee, we observed the modest sign-board of a national school fixed upon the walls of a convent, and we applied for admittance. We were presently ushered into a large hall, containing a vast assemblage of female children, who, as in the former instance, were receiving a gratuitous education from the nuns. It was pleasing to find, that, even in this remote part of the empire, the intellectual mode of instruction had been in a great measure adopted. The children acquitted themselves extremely well, and appeared to have not only profited by the direct lessons of the school, but also by the example of the elegant style of elocution and lady-like manners, held up to them by their mistresses.

"The ladies of this convent have kept school for many years, so that the children of several of their earlier pupils are now under their charge—a fact which speaks to the appreciation of education among the lower orders of the Irish. They teach four hundred pupils, with no reward but the consciousness of spending their lives in an humble endeavour to do good.

"Like the ladies at Kilkenny, they seemed anxious to impress upon us, that, so occupied, they could not be otherwise than happy. Lately they have been relieved of some part of the expenses of the school, by an annual contribution of sixteen pounds! and a few school books, by the National Board of Education, whose regulations they have accordingly adopted.

"The aid given by convents towards education in Ireland appears to be considerable. In Kilkenny we had found one, in which five hundred children were instructed; at Tralee, we were now visiting one, which gave instruction to four hundred; and a friend mentions, that he lately visited one at Galway, where the number of pupils was three hundred:—making twelve hundred children at three nunneries."

Mr. Butler Bryan, an Irish barrister, published a book some years ago, strongly urging the introduction of poor-laws, as a remedy for the most prominent evils and general distress then (in 1830) unhappily prevalent in Ireland. We perfectly agree with him, that a legal provision for the indigent and helpless will not dry up the sources of private charity, as Dr. Chalmers, and other pseudo-philanthropic writers on political economy, apprehend. Charity, in Ireland especially, is open-handed; sympathy for distress in any shape is one of the finest characteristics of the national disposition:—even the poor never refuse to share their scanty vegetable food with those who are poorer still!

Mr. Bryan's work has furnished us with some details which we had been unable to collect ourselves, relating to that most essential of all means for the amelioration of Ireland—the employment of the people in public and private undertakings, such as making roads, quays, and bridges, draining bogs, and improving the vast tracts of waste land still uncultivated, which would almost obviate the necessity of emigration; for, in point of fact, there is by no means that redundancy of population in the country commonly imagined. Moreover, as this intelligent writer remarks, “the history of every country proves, that the vacuum caused by emigration is immediately filled up, so that it is no remedy for a supposed surplus.”

In England, enclosure bills are perhaps too numerous, depriving the poor of the use of commons which they had enjoyed from time immemorial; and such is the rapid progress of agricultural improvement, that six millions of acres of land are calculated to have been enclosed in Great Britain during the last century.

“If,” says Mr. Bryan, “the landlords of Ireland were compelled by a labour rate to do their duty, there cannot be the slightest doubt that Ireland would give employment to more than her own population.

“With all the sources of productive labour for an increasing population, the emigration scheme is a political bubble—the worst offspring of the wildest and most mischievous reveries of Malthus.

“However interested individuals may seek to disguise the fact, it is alone to the pressure of the population in almost every country, that mankind are indebted for their deliverance from oppression: it is the urgent wants of an increasing population, that have forced legislators to reform bad laws, and have instigated the people to co-operate for their common benefit. This has produced a division of labour that multiplies and perfects all productions in a manner most miraculous.” *Practical View of Ireland*, p. 287.

We cannot, however, concur in the view he takes, of the system recently adopted of enlarging farms in Ireland, having been the cause “of reducing the peasants to a more unhappy condition than any other mode of cultivation, by taking the direction of labour out of their hands.” It was long a common mistake to suppose that large farms depopulated a country, but that notion has been refuted; and it has, on the contrary, been ascertained, by actual enumeration, that many more hands are in fact employed in Scotland since the farms were enlarged,—and employment of the people is what we contend for. It is certainly true, when applied to store farms in mountain districts, where only few hands are employed, as pasturage is necessarily of a peculiarly depopulating nature; but the consolidation of

farms has quite a different effect, and is far from being detrimental either to landlord or tenant.

Irish landlords (as a class, perhaps the worst in the world), generally regardless of any other consideration, than that of drawing the maximum of rent from the minimum of land, favouring any project which might gratify their short-sighted cupidity, have converted large tracts of tillage land into pasture, which system throws the country back; for as cattle spread, men disappear, and consumers and commerce with them, and thus the value of land eventually falls.

There is, according to Mr. Bryan, "a most ample and beneficial field for the employment of the people upon the western coast of Ireland, where there are few or no quays to land goods, and the navigation of the large rivers is impeded by bars, the tributary streams submerging large quantities of land."

"The lowest elevation of waste (improvable) land is 203 feet above the level of the sea at low water: their best manure, limestone gravel, lies in central hills, with every facility to improvement by water carriage.

"The chemical decomposition of peat soils is now well understood, so that, to use the language of Mr. Aiken and Sir H. Davy, such soils may become masses of manure; and there are strong grounds for belief, the latter philosopher declares, that any capital so expended, would, in a very few years, afford a great and increasing interest, and contribute to the wealth and prosperity of the kingdom at large."

"The bogs of Ireland (says Young) differ from the boggy, mossy, and fenny lands of England, with regard to the facility of reclaiming; and still more so in point of value. A vast proportion of the unreclaimed land of Ireland is undoubtedly productive; and nature has been so bountiful, that little skill and a small expense will do (according to Newenham); while in most other countries the natural manures are scanty, in Ireland they are almost every where to be found in the greatest abundance and perfection.

"The peat soil in the south of Holland, which formerly resembled the bog land of Ireland, is now the garden of Europe.

"If the proprietors of waste lands in Ireland will come fairly forward, give the people long leases, and let them at a fair rent, proportionate to their yearly produce, so that each party would have a mutual interest in their improvement, as is the case with Italy and the south of France, and allow also a pecuniary expenditure of three pounds an acre, the people will willingly give their present *waste labour* without any charge, in expectation of future independance. We may be asked, what is there to support the peasants while thus employed? The same means that support many of them now through nearly five months of idleness in the year."—*Practical View*, p. 244-6.

Since the work from which we have made the preceding extracts was published, a vast number of farmers and peasants

in the county of Waterford have cheerfully given their "waste labour" to the pious and industrious Trappists, who found an asylum about five years ago on Sir Richard Keane's estate, when driven from France; and those "idle drones, those lazy monks," have converted a farm of six hundred acres of barren moorland and useless bog, into verdant meadows, affording pasture to numerous herds of cattle and flocks of sheep, and into well cultivated fields, bearing luxurious crops of grain—besides promoting a spirit of improvement and habit of industry, until then unknown, around their well-built monastic residence, adorned with a chapel "large enough (Inglis says) to hold a dozen modern Irish Protestant churches within it." The example of this interesting colony will, we hope, ere long be followed in other parts of Ireland, in a moral, religious, industrious, and economical point of view, for in every one of them it is well worthy of imitation.

The Commissioners, in their reports on the bog and mountain districts in Ireland, give accounts of many successful attempts to reclaim peat soil, most of which, in the course of three years, generally repay the original outlay. We make the following extract from a Treasury minute now before us, dated 31st January 1831, printed by order of Parliament in 1832, recommending the attention of the Commissioners of Woods and Forests to the cultivation of crown lands in Ireland, by way of experiment, and we are enabled to state, from personal observations, that a considerable tract of those lands—Pobble o'Keefe (now called King William's town), near the source of the river Blackwater, on the confines of the counties of Cork and Kerry—has been brought into cultivation, and upwards of four hundred acres of bog land have been reclaimed, and now yield an ample return for all the expenditure. Land not worth a shilling an acre in its former state, is now worth twenty shillings. A new line of road passes through the crown estate; and we trust that the admirable example set by Lord Duncannon (for to him the merit of this truly national work is due), will not be lost on other Irish proprietors. The old rent of the crown lands of Pobble o'Keefe (3000 acres) was £30—about 2½d. an acre.—

"Viewing this subject in relation to the general interests of the country, the preservation of the peace, the relations of landlord and tenant, and the extension of wealth, your committee, though they depart reluctantly from what they consider a general principle, venture to recommend a trial of one or two experiments, on a limited scale, at the public expense.

"My Lords, consider that this interposition of the Crown may at once afford an example, and give a stimulus to the landed proprietors of Ireland, as well as bring to the test of experiment the various pro-

positions of parliamentary commissioners and committees, which recommend, as an object of the highest national importance, the reclamation of the waste lands of Ireland, ascertained to exceed in area *five millions of acres.*"

According to official documents, of those waste lands, the county of Kerry contains 150,000 statute acres, which might be reclaimed at an estimated expense of £107,950. King's and Queen's Counties contain about 100,000 acres,—Galway, Mayo, and Roscommon, 375,000 acres of bogs,—all of which might be converted into arable land, at an estimated expense little exceeding a guinea an acre, although, where the bog is deep, the fencing and draining would be much more expensive. Here is ample field for the employment of capital and labour, the latter over-abundant in Ireland!

Mr. Weale, who was dispatched to investigate the practicability of the projected experiment, observes in his report, March 1831:—

"Until then, the country situated to the south-east of Limerick was known to me only historically, as the theatre of desolating warfare in the reigns of Queen Elizabeth and James I, as the refuge of outlaws in the reign of King William and Queen Anne, and as the scene of the recent insurrection under the pseudonymous banner of Captain Rock. I could scarcely credit the evidence of my senses, that such extensive tracts of land, presenting a variety of fertile soils, and combining many other natural advantages, which were obviously capable of contributing largely to the wealth and prosperity of the nation, had not participated in the general improvement of the country—and remained neglected by the hand of civilization from the period at which its ancient proprietors, the last Earls of Desmond, had been dispossessed of it.

"Viewing the capabilities of the crown estate, I became strongly impressed with an opinion, that the Commissioners would feel, that considerations of a higher nature than those which usually govern them in the management of the revenues placed under their charge, ought to influence their decision on the ultimate disposition of that property.

"This large district of country contains but two small villages, and only two resident proprietors, the distance between whose houses is thirty-eight British miles! It chiefly belongs to absentee proprietors, which, combined with the want of roads, and the turbulence of the people, have been the cause of its neglected state."

The banks of the same river—the Blackwater—within twenty miles from that picture of desolation and depopulation, so ably delineated in Mr. Weale's report in 1831, present a very different and much more pleasing aspect in 1837, according to the report of a Government engineer employed to fix the boundaries of the Irish boroughs. He says—

"In the neighbourhood of Mallow, there are sixty-three country residences, all occupied by families of the first respectability, within a circuit of not more than seven miles."

And there is no reason why a similar picture of rural prosperity should not be exhibited in almost every district of Ireland, with the boundless capabilities presented by fertile land, noble rivers, capacious bays, safe harbours, rich mineral treasures, and a coast presenting the finest resources for the employment of hardy and skilful fishermen.

There is no *physical* obstacle to prevent the developement of the many natural advantages Ireland possesses in a supereminent degree, independent of her peculiarly happy geographical position, so well adapted for commercial intercourse with Europe and America, now that tranquillity is restored, and the assize judges have nearly a sinecure; all that is wanting to render this fine country the abode of industry, is a continuance of good government, in order that the beneficial measures which the present liberal ministers are about to introduce, and sincerely desirous of carrying into effect, may not be frustrated by the machinations of an anti-national faction, abetted by the irresponsible branch of the legislature.

The system of thwarting every project which tended in any degree to benefit Ireland, by improving its agriculture, commerce, or navigation, seems habitual to the "Upper House," as it is termed by courtesy. Mr. Bryan, from whose book we have already made several quotations, states:—

"In 1828, I contributed my humble assistance towards drawing up a drainage and enclosure bill for Ireland, in conjunction with the patriotic member for Armagh, Mr. Brownlow, and Mr. Nimmo, the civil engineer.

"We had several great objects in view in that bill. First, to compel co-operation in the drainage of the country, for public sewers are as requisite as public roads, and all who are benefited thereby should contribute. We would also have extended inland navigation by its arrangement. Secondly, we sought by it to ascertain the boundaries of the respective proprietors of waste lands, at present but ill-defined. Thirdly, in case of the sale of those lands, we gave a secure or parliamentary title to the purchaser.

"This bill passed the Commons, and was twice read in the Lords; a member of the Duke of Wellington's administration then stated, that it required some amendments, but did not condescend to bring them forward. The result has been, that this peer has had the merit of depriving many starving families of the means of procuring an honest subsistence."—*Practical View*, p. 251.

The drainage act of 1st and 2d William IV, has been found inadequate to meet the exigencies of the country. Mr. Lynch's

bills, whose object was greatly similar to those Mr. Bryan alludes to (as having been defeated by a noble member of the Tory government of that day), will, we trust, be again brought forward in the next session of parliament, and prove more effectual. The Marquis of Clanricarde also introduced a bill in the House of Lords, the purport of which (we are unacquainted with its details) was of the same nature, though less comprehensive than either of the others. Let us hope it may meet with a better fate; we trust, at all events, if any noble lord thinks it would be improved by amendments, he may "condescend to bring them forward."

The Irish people are no longer to be trifled with, to suit the caprice of any man, or set of men. What the peasantry want is, first, exemption from oppression; secondly, work; and finally, a fair remuneration for their labour; and it is hard to deny an industriously inclined peasant *leave* to cultivate his native soil. We do not mean merely labour in public works, undertaken only for the purpose of affording temporary employment, which is bad on principle; for, in Ireland, the money thus laid out would find its way into the pockets of the landlords, who would contrive to raise their rents at the public expense; although national advantage may result, whenever money is not taken from private, and perhaps beneficial, employment, to be invested in some other purpose, which offers little or no chance of turning out productive.

"Mr. Nimmo expended £167,000 in Connaught alone in seven years; the increase of the annual revenue to government, in consequence, has since been equal to the whole of the expenditure. Mr. Griffiths, another engincer, in the Cork district, expended £60,000 in the same space of time; and the increase to Government revenue, in customs and excise, in the district, has been £50,000 a-year, which is to be attributed mainly to the increased facility of communication, by which the whole districts have been rendered available for productive purposes."—*Practical View*, p. 219.

We have procured Mr. Griffiths' report, printed by order of the House of Commons in April 1832, from which we select an interesting account of a long-neglected district on the confines of Cork and Kerry, the theatre of the Whiteboy insurrection in 1821, now intersected by a new line of road, extending to seventy-five English miles.

"At the commencement of the works, the people flocked to them from all quarters, seeking employment at any rate which might be offered: their general appearance bespoke extreme poverty, their looks were haggard, and their clothing wretched: they rarely possessed any tools, or implements of husbandry, beyond a very small ill-made spade,

and the whole face of the country was in a state of nature. But since the completion of the roads, rapid strides have been made towards cultivation and improvement.

"Upwards of sixty lime kilns, besides houses of a better class, have been built; carts, ploughs, and harrows of superior construction, and other agricultural implements, have become common; new enclosures of mountain farms are being made; and this country, which, within the last seven years, was the theatre of lawless outrage, has become perfectly tranquil, and exhibits a scene of industry and exertion at once pleasing and remarkable.

"To the credit of the inhabitants, I must say, that a large proportion of the money received by them for labour on the roads, has been husbanded with care, and subsequently laid out in building substantial houses, and in the purchase of cattle and implements of husbandry.

"I have not been able to ascertain on what grounds the intended improvements (connecting the new roads with others to be formed through the crown estates) were relinquished. There remains a considerable portion, extending northwards from the river Blackwater to a line drawn between the towns of Castle Island and Newmarket, comprehending an area of about two hundred square miles, or 128,000 acres, in which there is no road passable for horsemen during the winter months."

Much progress has been made in opening new lines of road, railways, and communications by land and water, throughout Ireland, since the date of Mr. Griffiths' report, by which an extensive field for the employment of the people is afforded, with a prospect of yielding beneficial returns to private speculators who have undertaken some of these enterprises.

Road-making has likewise occupied the attention of the grand juries, and, since the new act, they evince a willingness to co-operate with the government in carrying improvements into effect, very different from the adverse local influences which prevailed under the old "jobbing" system, happily extinct.—The Inland Navigation Company has been productive of great benefit—facilitating commercial intercourse, particularly on that noble river the Shannon, and the canals which connect it with the capital.

We were somewhat surprised, in looking over Mr. M'Culloch's "Statistical Account of the British Empire," published *last year*, to find that he represents Ireland not as it is at present, but as it was during the *last century*. Even his geological information, as to the localities where limestone prevails, is, in some respects, incorrect; and, instead of giving a true account of the actual state of Irish agriculture, his materials are drawn from sources, which, however valuable twenty or fifty years ago, are now obsolete, such as Arthur Young, C. Curwen, and Gilbert Wake-

field! Mr. M'Culloch describes Ireland, such as it was under the horrors of penal laws and insurrections, the fertile fruit of Orange-Tory despotism, which carried its withering influence from the castle to the hovel; but now, thank God, a new era has commenced,—for, in the emphatic language of the first commoner of the empire, “a complete transfer of power from a faction to a nation has taken place in Ireland,” and its abundant natural capabilities, by getting free scope, are rapidly developing themselves, while abuses are daily being eradicated. Good roads are opening access to the most remote districts; and places which, at the beginning of the present century, were mere villages, are become handsome thriving towns, possessing a large export trade, with banking and commercial establishments on a scale commensurate with their rising importance.

The laborious statist, whose works we refer to, has no doubt a difficult task to perform; having such a mass of facts to collect, he must employ contributors, who copy from others; and allege that the estimates furnished by government engineers of the expense of draining bogs, and improving waste lands, are altogether hypothetical, and entitled to no weight, as no bogs have been drained, nor any land brought into profitable cultivation. And this statement is made, with the official report of Lord Headley's Kerry estate, published by Parliament, and the experiment successfully tried on the Crown lands at Pobble O'Keefe, open to his inspection, and that of the public at large, by means of parliamentary documents.

That Ireland is still in a backward state, compared to what she might have been, if heretofore under good government, is undeniable; but that the condition of the people is nearly as much depressed at this moment, as at any former period, is a great mistake on the part of the compiler of the “Statistical Account.” Wages have risen materially, while provisions are cheaper; labour on public and private works is more abundant; the people are better clothed and fed; their children are better educated, and a million and half sterling has been invested in the saving-banks! With these facts before one's eyes, it is impossible to doubt the growing prosperity of the country.

The produce of the land—a better system of husbandry having been generally introduced, and a vast portion of bog reclaimed—has increased from thirty to forty-fold in the course of a century; the population has quadrupled within the same time; and after supplying their own consumption, they are enabled to export between two and three million quarters of grain to England annually. A hundred years ago, the whole export of Ireland did not exceed 30,000 quarters of corn; tillage must have im-

proved to enable an increasing population to effect this phenomenon. The exports of cattle, sheep, and pigs, from Ireland to the port of Liverpool alone, in the course of the first six months of the present year, exceed 900,000*l.* in value; the facilities afforded by steam navigation having opened a new mine of wealth to all parts of the kingdom.

We have attributed much of the still existing misery to bad landlords, but there are, fortunately, exceptions even among absentees. We need not recapitulate what Mr. Inglis has said regarding some public-spirited English proprietors, and the improvements making on their estates; though it may be remarked, that these noble landlords, who are setting so philanthropic an example, are, almost without an exception, liberals in politics.

Intelligent agents, and skillful practical men as land-stewards, are essential to the amelioration of the estates of absentees, (which comprehend so large a portion of the surface of Ireland) and evidences of both are generally apparent. Green crops, not merely the potatoe as of old, are everywhere becoming more prevalent, though it is difficult to eradicate ancient habits, even to substitute more profitable ones. The peasantry are now no longer guilty of the barbarism of pulling out vetches, houghing cattle, and digging up pasture-land by night. Any candid observer must acknowledge, that a marked improvement has taken place in the moral and physical condition of the bulk of the Irish people; it only requires time and a continuance of impartial local government, to raise the frame-work of society to the level of that of England. In point of intelligence, the Irish have already the advantage over the English peasantry; as regards education, they are on a par, though perhaps inferior to the Scotch in the latter particular.

To show what landlords, who know their own interests, may *effect*, and how easy it is to manage even the rudest and most ignorant boor by adopting kind and conciliatory measures, we insert the following extract from "Hints to Irish Landlords," by Mr. Wiggins, an English practical agriculturist, published some years ago, abridging it as we have been obliged to do other documents.

"Lord Headly's estate of Glenbeg, situated in a wild district of Kerry, at the entrance of the Iveragh Mountains, consisting of 15,000 acres, much of which is rocky, boggy, and mountain ground, was, in 1807, inhabited by a people, to whom the bare idea of labour was offensive, and work considered as slavery, though a robust, active, enterprising, and hospitable race of peasantry.

"Lord Headly resolved to cultivate their good qualities, without being at first very eager to punish their bad ones, and has succeeded in introducing a degree of improvement and cultivation, which without

these effects, must have required a century. They are now well clothed, and as orderly and well-conducted as you see in any village in England. Agriculture has improved with very little sacrifice of rent or money.

"The system pursued by Lord Headly is perfectly applicable to any part of Ireland. There was an application of land to a bog (peat) surface, and it was let at 4*l.* an acre the year after it was reclaimed.

"No country requires so much drainage as Ireland; there the means of employing the people, in reclaiming bog and mountain land, and making roads, is generally to be found.

"I consider the *best capital of Ireland to be the industry of the people*: my mode of setting it a-going, would be by the introduction of a plan, having the effect of compelling labour, as I conceive the Poor-Laws of England have. Persons would not be willing to feed the poor, and clothe and lodge them, without having the benefit of their labour in return, and I think this labour would return its expense four-fold."

In the Fifth Annual Report of the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland, dated March 1837, they enumerate the beneficial results of their application of parliamentary grants, and loans of exchequer bills, in advancing the various national works now in progress, and their advantageous effect on the lower classes of the people.

"In the course of last summer, distress prevailed in the county of Donegal His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant was pleased to appropriate a sum of money to the purchase of meal and potatoes, to be applied for the relief of the inhabitants, by paying them in provisions for their labour, applied to the construction of roads in that wild and uncultivated district. Thirteen miles of roads were made and repaired by their dispensation of meal, &c.; the computed value of which, was something under 650*l.*, and relief was afforded (including gratuitous assistance to the sick and helpless) to nearly 40,000 persons. * *

"It is not true, as it has been sometimes asserted, that the want of energy of the labourer in some parts of the interior of Ireland, arises from a natural defect of character, that inclines him, like the sloth, to labour only to the extent necessary to procure the most wretched diet, with which he is satisfied.

"The result of society in Ireland may lead a cursory observer to that conclusion, for it too often happens that the peasant is reduced in circumstances, to the extent of being burdened with a heavy debt, in the shape of arrears for rent, which cannot by possibility be paid from the profits of his small holding; the consequence is, that any extra exertion would be thrown away, so far as his own personal advantage is concerned, and therefore inactivity arises. But when roused, by fair opportunities being laid before them and explained, we find that those who can profit by them, are perfectly willing to do so. Nor can we doubt, that by a more general introduction of such opportunities, the Irish labourers will become fully equal to the same class in England, and for the same remuneration will do the same quantity of work. We deem it, however, bad policy to put them off with inferior

remuneration; the labourer is degraded by too low wages, while the employer himself obtains very little advantage.

"We have, with these views, and to give a fair trial to different modes of proceeding, in some instances, formed establishments, and carried on the works by day-labour, and small contracts, which have led to more satisfaction to the workmen, and improved their condition, as well as the moral feeling with regard to employment, and to a much better understanding of improved mechanical means, and their application."

The three extracts we have given from such respectable and authentic sources, fully substantiate the favourable view we have taken of the excellent qualities and dispositions of the Irish peasantry, independent of the great public principle now involved, in treating them with impartial justice. Surely the experiment is worth trying; harsh and coercive measures we know, by long and dear-bought experience, having signally failed. Let the great and still undeveloped resources of the country—now tranquil and free from crime, because well governed—be called into action, by kind treatment of a hardy and patient population; whose cheerful labour, it would be better policy to avail ourselves of at home, than to compel them to banish themselves to a foreign clime—the United States, the wilds of Canada, or the remote Australia, in order to earn a precarious livelihood, while they are *entitled* to subsistence in the land of their birth. It need not be added, that the emigration part of the proposed poor-law scheme, is not that which we most admire, nor do we deem it necessary.

The subject, however, is too important to be dismissed in a summary manner, such as our space demands; it requires ample discussion, and merits no small portion of public attention when brought before the legislature.

Ireland, with her productive soil, genial climate, and vast capabilities, might be a happy country, and occupy an elevated position among nations, if those who have so long enjoyed a monopoly of all employments, commands, and dignities, "even that of the priesthood," like the *populum regem*, would lay aside their prejudices, banish their ignorant horror of popery, and hold out the hand of good-fellowship to their less fortunate countrymen; evincing their sincerity by ceasing to oppose the introduction of those reforms, which, under the auspices of our young and beloved sovereign, must be conceded. Then Ireland would truly become what she has hitherto been only poetically,

"Great, glorious, and free,
First flower of the earth, first gem of the sea."

ART. VII.—1. *Letters from an Irish Protestant to the People of Scotland.* 1836.

2. *Blackwood's Magazine.*

IN a former article,* it was shown that various editions of the Scriptures had appeared in the respective tongues of Italy, France, Spain, Germany, and the Netherlands, previous to Luther's German version, which, by a singular ignorance or dissimulation of the fact, is usually viewed as the first vernacular translation of the Bible, and, as such, the parent and source of the Reformation. But in that article, not less than fifty distinct impressions, in the native dialects of Europe, are indicated; and though some rather represented the history than the text of Scripture, a more accurate research will demonstrate that the existing literal versions of the Bible in 1534, when Luther completed his, even exceeded that number.† And if we consider all the circumstances of the period; the comparatively few who could read; the high prices of books under the difficulties of an infant art; the nearly two hundred successive editions of the *Latin Vulgate*, almost equally accessible to persons of education, who alone could read, and the great majority of whom were ecclesiastics, it will be found that every rational want was fully provided for. The supply was adequate to the demand, and if the increased publications, immediately consequent on the Reformation, be urged in contradiction, we may authorizedly answer, that an interested and artificial cry was then raised, as it is at the present hour, when we know that millions of Bibles have been circulated without the requisition, or we apprehend, the benefit, of the people among whom they have been distributed.‡ At all events, they were not the novelties, or sealed volumes,

* No. II. Art. IV.

† The edition of Wittenberg, in 1541, contains his last revision of the text. His own copy, with his autograph, and those of Melancthon, Bugenhagen, and others, was sold at Mr. Hibbert's sale, in 1829, (No. 8724) for £267. 15s., and purchased for the British Museum. Luther's New Testament had appeared in September 1522; (Ebert Allgemeines bibliographisches Lexicon, No. 2266) and other detached portions in succession; but the whole, or as the Protestants require, the *unmutilated* Bible, not till 1534.—*Horne's Appendix.*

‡ Thousands of these Bibles are pawned immediately on receipt, and unread, as their virgin state in the pawnbrokers' windows will show; pretty much like that in the library at Worlingham, in Suffolk, which belonged to Charles II, and in which was written—

"Hark! ye, my friends, that on this Bible look,
Marvel not at the fairness of the book;
No soil of fingers, nor such ugly things,
Expect to find; Sirs! for it was the king's."

Dibdin's Library Companion, p. 34.

that historians, with the most discreditable carelessness of inquiry and hardihood of assertion, have represented them. Robertson, (*Charles V*, vol. ii. p. 205, in 4to.) it would seem, was either ignorant, or wilfully suppressed the mention, of any translation prior to Luther's, which he describes as pregnant with marvellous discoveries and effects; nor do our other writers appear better informed, or more candid.

It will be seen, on the other hand, as we proceed, that it was almost solely in those countries which have remained constant to the Catholic faith, that these popular versions had been published; so little did they prepare the way for, or promote the innovation; while it was precisely in those kingdoms, England, Scotland, Sweden, Denmark, and Norway, where Protestantism acquired an early, and has maintained a permanent, ascendancy, that no Bible existed before they embraced the new creed. We mean, of course, printed translations; for the cost and paucity of manuscripts placed them wholly beyond common reach or effect, though it was exclusively to Catholics that the preservation of manuscripts, and through them of the divine word, is due, as we have heard the illustrious Cuvier emphatically declare, and gratefully acknowledge, in his luminous review of the origin and progress of science, preliminary to his last course of public lectures.

Those who exclaim against the scanty supply, as alleged, of Bibles before the Reformation, entirely overlook the important consideration, that it was first necessary the people should read, a faculty rare indeed, because of difficult exercise and uncertain use, previous, and for some time subsequent to, the invention of printing. In the fourteenth century, Bertrand du Guesclin, "le plus grand guerrier," says his biographer, "de son siècle, ne sut jamais lire ni écrire, à l'exemple de tous les nobles de cette époque;" and two hundred years after, we find another Constable of France, Anne de Montmorency, the undisputed head of the French nobility, equally illiterate. Charlemagne, at an anterior period, did not learn to write until advanced in years, nor then with much success; "sed parum prospere successit, præposterus et sero inchoatus," are the words of his secretary. (*Gibbon*, vol. v. 140, 4to. ed.) Our own statute-book, likewise affords sufficient proof of the fewness of readers, in the exemption from punishment, or arrest of judgment after conviction, granted to criminals capable of reading—an act not formally repealed till 1706. (*Blackstone*, book iv. ch. 28.) Persons of the highest station, as our public records show, were *marksmen*, a word, we may observe, not to be found with that construction in the early editions of *Johnson's Dictionary*, but Mr. Todd has

illustrated its application by an appropriate reference. The original Solemn League and Covenant, (see *Dalrymple's Memoirs of Great Britain*, vol. ii. p. 25; *Hume*, vi. 595, and *Lingard*, x. 51) now deposited in the British Museum, exhibits an abundance of marksmen, all of whom, from the horror of Popery then entertained, have left the cross unfinished, and signed in the shape of the letter T. (*Nicholson and Burns' History of Cumberland*, p. 324.) Shakspeare's father, though chief alderman of Stratford, could not write; (*Skottowe's Life of Shakspeare*, 1824) nor could the trustees of his marriage-contract with Anne Hathway, in 1582, otherwise most respectable citizens.*

Numberless proofs exist of the high prices of books before the discovery of printing. Ames, in his *History of the English Press*, (Lond. 1749, 4to.) says, "I have a folio manuscript in French, called *Roman de la Rose*, on the last leaf of which is wrote, 'Cest lyver costa au palais de Paris quarante couronnes d'or sans mentyr.'" (*Dibdin's Typogr. Antig.* vol. i. p. 11.) This sum is valued by Ames at £33. 6s. 8d. British; but it is considerably more. M. Petit Radel, (*Recherches sur les Bibliothèques*, Paris, 1819, 8vo.) writes, "Au treizième siècle, le prix moyen des livres, non surchargés d'ornemens, était de quatre à cinq cents francs d'aujourd'hui." The common price of a missal was five marks, equal to the yearly revenue of a vicar or curate, (*Townley's Illustrations of Biblical Literature*, vol. ii. p. 82) and Chevillier, the Parisian printer, in his *Histoire de l'Imprimerie*, (Paris, 1694, 4to.) says, that Louis XI was obliged to pledge a quantity of plate, in addition to the joint bond of a nobleman, as security for the loan of a translation of the Arabic Physician, *Rhasis*. The immediate reduction of prices produced by the great discovery, and which exposed Iust, (probably the origin of Dr. Faustus) to the imputation of sorcery, on the cheap sale of his great Bible of 1462, at Paris, appears, from a letter or address to Pope Paul II, prefixed to the Bishop of Alerio's edition of the

* That Shakspeare's father was a Catholic, is conclusive, from the invocation of the Virgin, &c., in his Will; nor is there any thing in the poet's own works to show that he was not one himself. Several passages would rather prove that he was; such as, "I am thy father's spirit," &c., in Hamlet, (Act i. Scene 5), in commenting on which, Mr. Whalley (Johnson and Stevens' edition, 1793) says, "that Shakspeare speaks more like a Catholic than a Platonist." His contemporary, Massinger, according to his editor, Mr. Gifford, (1813, 4 vols. 8vo.) was a Catholic. The invocation of Saints, prelusive to wills, even extends to the private letters of the Oriental Christians; and it is difficult to repress a smile, at the result of good Bishop Heber's efforts to exhibit to the Patriarchs, or *Mars* of the Eastern Churches, the errors of Popery, and rally them to his side; but their answers, uniformly commencing with the invocation of "Our Lady, the pure Mary, and the host of Martyrs and Saints," may indicate the measure of his success.—Appendix to his Journal, vol. ii. 467, 4to.

Epistles of St. Jerome in 1468, to have been four-fifths. "What used to cost one hundred crowns, fell to twenty;" and, of course, a gradual decline to a greater extent followed the progress of the art. The consequent advantage to poor students, is thus quaintly described by Jean Molinet, a contemporary poet, whose works accompany the poems of his predecessor, Froissart, in Mr. Buchan's late edition of that renowned chronicler (Paris, 1829):

"J'ai veu grant multitude
De livres imprimés,
Pour tenir en estude
Pauvres mal argentés.
Par ces nouvelles modes,
Aura maint escollier
Décret, Bible et Code,
Sans grant argent bailler."

Accordingly, we learn from Maittaire, (*Annal. Typogr.* pars ii. p. 472) that, in 1547, Robert Stephens sold his quarto Hebrew Bible, (4 vols. 1539-1544) at sixty to one hundred sols, (*solidi*) and his beautiful small edition, (8 vols. 16mo. 1544-1546) for forty-five sols; while the price of his New Testaments, (*O Mirificum*) 1546 and 1549, in 12mo. was six sols each. The cost of beef, at that time, was about one halfpenny, or sol, the pound, (*Chronicon Preciosum*, p. 162) so that the sol was nearly equivalent to the modern franc. See also T. Wharton's *History of English Poetry*, Second Dissertation.

The early translations to which we have adverted, had, for their model, the Latin of St. Jerome, which, in truth, nearly superseded their use, for it was intelligible to most readers; the few who possessed that advantage being generally churchmen, and those who were not, would naturally prefer a fixed idiom (one that opened, likewise, to their enjoyment, the treasures of antiquity) to the barbarous and unsettled jargon, then, with the exception of Italy, almost every where spoken or written. We are quite aware that the language of the *Vulgate* is not classical, nor surely is that of the original Gospels; but it is unvarying, and, in its homeliness, not without attraction, such as the *Imitation of Christ* offers, which few, we are confident, would exchange for the most exquisite Latinity; "Le livre le plus beau," as characterized by Fontenelle, "qui soit parti de la main d'un homme, puisque l'évangile n'en vient pas."* The attempt

* In Fontenelle's life of his uncle, *le Grand Corneille*, quoted by Tachereau, (vie de Pierre Corneille, 1827, p. 180) Corneille translated the *Imitation* into verse, (Paris, 1651-1656, 4to.) more to the credit of his piety than his taste. * The Greek version, by the Jesuit G. Mayer, was reprinted very neatly in 1824, by Didot, at Paris, 12mo. It is very literal, and simple in style, as the original. No book, except the Bible,

of Sebastian Castalio to transfuse the sacred text into Ciceronian Latin, has been justly derided for its affectation, though not without its partizans in England. For *angelus*, he substitutes *genius*; for *baptismo*, *lotio*; *respublica* supplies *ecclesia*, and *collegium* replaces *synagoga*. It was published at Basil, 1551, in folio, and followed by his French version in 1557, which, on the other hand, is disgraced by the most ignoble diction, even for that period. In Psalm lxxviii, where our English authorized version has, "He chose David for his servant, and took him from the sheepfolds," this reformer, or as the Jesuit, Frs. Garasse, (*Doctrine Curieuse*, &c., Paris, 1623, p. 203, 4to.) calls him, "ce vrai porcher," renders it, "il le tira du cul d'une charrue;" and "Mercy rejoiceth against judgment," (*Epist. St. James*, c. ii. v. 13) he makes, "la miséricorde fait la figue au jugement;" thus exemplifying, it must be granted, the *traduttore e traditore* of the Italians.

Various other Latin translations by Protestants have sunk into oblivion; but the Vulgate has constantly risen in the estimation of the learned. The Rev. Mr. Horne, in his *Introduction to the Critical Study of the Scriptures*, vol. ii. p. 239, cites the authority of Richard Simon, the learned oratorian, to show, "that the more ancient the Greek manuscripts and other versions are, the more closely do they agree with the Vulgate, which has, in consequence, been more justly appreciated." (R. Simon, *Histoire Critique*, &c. Rotterd. 1688, 4to.) And, adds Mr. Horne, whose testimony in this respect must carry especial weight, "the Latin Vulgate preserves many true readings, where the modern Hebrew copies are corrupt." All the more recent German critics, who will hardly be arraigned of partiality, ascribe the highest value to this venerable translation, which Bacon, it has been observed, always preferably uses even in his English works, but to which his countrymen long refused all merit, pretty much for the same reason that induced them, during 170 years, (1582-1752,) to reject the reformed calendar, merely because it emanated from Rome. This supposed impurity of source was deemed a justifying motive; and yet England accepted the Reformation from Henry, as Denmark did from Christiern, two of the greatest monsters that ever disgraced, not only the throne, but human nature. Lord Chesterfield's letter to his son of 7th April 1751, when the reformed calendar was under legislative discussion, deserves perusal; nor ought it to

has been so often printed as this volume, whose authorship seems yet undetermined, notwithstanding the numerous claimants to its composition, in Italy, France, and Belgium. Were we to hazard an opinion, it would be in favour of Gerson, Chancellor of the University of Paris, as Bossuet also thought.

escape animadversion, that such men as Newton and Napier should suffer the gross astronomical error to pass unrebuked, rather than avow an obligation to Rome; but the darkest prejudice overshadowed their reason, as the commentaries of both on the Apocalypse sufficiently evince.

A fundamental rule of the Bible Society prescribes the exclusive use of the authorized English version, without note or comment. This is a recognition of the principle, on which the Catholic Church assigns a similar prerogative of authenticity to the Latin Vulgate, and equally warrants the Catholic pastor in forbidding any other than the Douay translation, which, not only is not interdicted, but urgently recommended. The Rev. Dr. Harmer, (*Critica Sacra*, vol. ii. p. 82,) renders justice, in this respect, to the Catholic Church, and transcribes the pressing exhortation to the reading of the Bible in the French version of De Sacy. The authority of Pius VI, in his letter of 1st April, 1778, to Antonio Martini, afterwards Archbishop of Florence, on his excellent translation, (Turin, 1776-1781,) now uniformly precedes the Douay New Testament, as an incentive to its perusal.*

As for the "Bible without note or comment," it certainly was not the design of the translators appointed by James I, that the book should so circulate; for the heads of chapters are, all through, running, or rather leading commentaries on the text, as the slightest inspection will demonstrate. Indeed, common sense, not less than experience, will justify the indignant demand of Mr., now Lord, Stanley, directed, in March 1832, to some fervent biblicals in parliament, "whether, as parents, they could put the whole Bible into the hands of their children, without the superintendence of a religious instructor?" Yet, from his letter to Mr. Hodgson, in August 1836, a new light seems to have dawned on his lordship; but the curators of lunatic asylums can best elucidate the consequences of committing to the indiscriminate reader, and to capricious interpretation, a volume which unveils not its mysteries to intuitive ken or perception, and which levelled in impotent and humiliating prostration the most powerful of intellects.

It is doubtless proper, indeed indispensable, that the stamp of authenticity should distinguish one of the groundworks of

* Cardinal Beausset, ("Vie de Bossuet," tom. i. p. 209,) defines the motives of precaution in the Catholic Church against the attempt at translation, by every pretender or enthusiast—"Son véritable motif a été de prémunir les fideles contre les interprétations fausses ou hazardées, que quelques novateurs osoient se permettre, pour propager leurs erreurs à l'ombre d'une autorité sacrée." And common sense will confirm this precaution. "Bossuet," adds the Cardinal, "était, en général, favorable aux traductions en langue vulgaire," &c. Ibid. p. 210.

our faith, and fix that text, so ostentatiously invoked by our opponents; for to it, the Catholic Church equally appeals, and in it, as its best expositor, has ever found her firmest support. The character of authenticity impressed by the Council of Trent on the Latin Vulgate, is clearly defined. (*Sessio* iv. 8vo. *Aprilis* 1546.) “*Insuper eadem sacrosancta Synodus . . . statuit et declarat, ut hæc ipsa vetus et vulgata editio, quæ longo tot sæculorum usu, in ipsâ ecclesiâ probata est, in publicis lectionibus, disputationibus, prædicationibus et expositionibus pro authenticâ habeatur.*” No reasonable person can object to this exposition, which is equivalent to the words prefixed, with the same view, to the English Bible—“By his Majesty’s special command—Appointed to be read in Churches.” And the Latin Vulgate offers the peculiar advantage of being the uniform standard of reference, in every portion of the earth where a Catholic exists.

“Far as the breeze can bear, the billow foam,
Survey our empire!”

The dedication of the English version to that “Sun in his strength, whom the heavenly hand of the Lord hath enriched with many singular graces, that he may be the wonder of the world, &c.,” will show, how far the learned interpreters were imbued with the Holy Spirit whom they had invoked, when they addressed, in such terms, a monarch, the shame alike of royalty and of manhood. (See *Von Raumer’s Beiträge zur neueren Geschichte aus Britische Museum. Erster Band*, 1836.) The chief merit of this translation is, unquestionably, in the idiomatic structure of its language; but it can bear no comparison, in accuracy of construction, with the Latin Vulgate. Without appealing to Ward’s *Errata*, we have the admission of Louth, Newcombe, Wakefield, Bellamy, and numerous other English divines, that the errors are frequent, and a revision desirable, in which the Rev. Mr. Horne expresses his concurrence, (vol. ii. p. 78,) but, like the Ark of the Covenant, to touch it is profanation. The glaring blunders of the press, which have been found to pervade almost every edition, have been often animadverted on, as may be seen in Dr. Dibdin’s *Library Companion*, Mr. Carey’s tract, &c., and do little credit, indeed, to the supervisors of what is so emphatically proclaimed, *the pure word of God*—the archetype, too, of a great portion of those versions, which the Bible Society have sent forth for the propagation of truth.

The Protestants, on the other hand, long rung the changes on the variances of the Vulgate, and its successive emendations, until the final adjustment of the text by Clement VIII, in 1592

and 1593; but they have been most fully answered by Joseph Bianchini, a learned Father of the Oratory, in his *Vindiciæ Canonicarum Scripturarum Vulgatæ Editionis, Romæ* 1740, in folio, and by others—and it is our conviction, that if the learned world, including all persuasions, were now limited to the choice and possession of a single text of holy writ, as has been hypothetically proposed in regard to books on other subjects, the majority of collected suffrages would declare in favour of this Catholic authority, as the most genuine expression of the revealed will of Heaven. How incorrect that text is in the original languages, may be learned from the fact, that Dr. Kennicott found ten thousand various readings in the collation of about six hundred Hebrew manuscripts, though none, as he affirmed to his royal patron, George III, to affect any essential tenet of Christianity; and the gleanings of De Rossi, subsequent to the learned Doctor's labours, have not been inconsiderable. Nor have Wetstein, Griesbach, Alder, and others, been less successful in discovering an equal dissidence, proportionably to its extent, in the Greek manuscripts of the New Testament, of which nearly seven hundred have been subjected to examination.

The earliest great effort of the master-art—the primogenial fruit of the press—was the Latin Vulgate, which appeared between the years 1450 and 1455, and is distinguished as the Mazarine Bible. It was fitting, indeed, that the sacred volume should receive the first homage of the mighty invention, best calculated to diffuse its light, and impart its blessings. A more appropriate tribute could not be offered, nor does a nobler monument remain of the power that produced it. It has been the object of admiration to every writer who has described the book, from Naudé to Dr. Dibdin, and it was followed in quick succession by about two hundred editions of the same text, before Luther achieved his German version. The Latin was, and long continued to be, the medium of communication and instruction. Four-fifths of published books were necessarily in that tongue, which was intelligible to an equal proportion of readers, to whom, therefore, these two hundred impressions were equivalent, in use, to the same number of vernacular editions.

On a former occasion,* however, it was shown, that no less than fifty versions, literal or historical, of the Bible, in the native idioms of Europe, had likewise preceded Luther's. But, in fact, they were more numerous, for several have been discovered since 1723, the date of Lelong's *Bibliographia Sacra*,

* No. II. Art. IV.

or its continuation by Masch, in 1778-1790, the authorities chiefly relied on in the article to which we allude. "Are you aware that the Bohemians had published seven editions of the Scriptures before Luther began his great German Bible?" writes Mr. John Strang, in his recent travels, (*Germany in 1831*, vol. ii. p. 204.) Of German Bibles, it is also ascertained, that the library purchased in 1784 by the Duke of Wirtemberg, at Copenhagen, of the Rev. Mr. Lork, contained not less than twenty-three editions prior to Luther's, and this number has since been increased by various acquisitions, amongst which was that of the laborious Panzer's collection. This bibliographer, in his *Annalen der Alten Deutschen Litteratur*, (Nuremberg 1788, and Supplement, 1802, in 4to.) reckoned eleven editions to which he could assign no distinct date, but which were not posterior to 1480, independently of others with specific dates; but our best authority, on the subject, is the work of Fred. Ad. Ebert, *Allgemeines Bibliographisches Lexicon*, printed at Leipsic, in successive parts, (1821-1830, two vols. 4to.) The author is royal librarian at Dresden, where he has under his charge 260,000 volumes. (*Essai Statistique sur les Bibliothèques*, par M. Balbi, Vienne, 1835, 8vo.)

The royal library of Stuttgart possesses, beyond doubt, the most extensive assemblage of Bibles ever formed. The foundation was laid in the purchase, to which we have alluded, of Mr. Lork's collection, of which the catalogue was published in 1787 at Hamburg, under the title of *Bibliotheca Wurtembergensium Ducis, olim Lorkiana, auctore J. G. Ch. Aldero*. The biblical articles amounted to 5155, and those obtained, at the decease of Panzer, to 1645. The duke, grandfather of the reigning King of Wirtemberg, had, indeed, commenced the library in its general departments, so early as 1768; and, in 1804, it consisted of above 100,000 volumes, which, in 1818, when visited by Dr. Dibdin, had increased to 130,000. Of these, 8,200 were Bibles, exclusive of duplicates; and, in 1835, M. Balbi estimated the whole collection at 174,000 printed, and 1800 manuscript volumes, the Bibles constituting from 9,000 to 10,000, and still requiring about 3000 to complete the collection. (*Dibdin's Tour*, vol. iii. p. 21. See also, *Versuch einer Beschreibung*, &c. by Fr. Gott. Hirsching, Erlang. 1786, and Balbi's *Essai Statistique sur les Bibliothèques*.) A version unheard of until late years, is the Spanish, or rather Catalanian, described by M. de la Serna Santander, (*Dictionnaire Bibliogr.* tom. ii. p. 197,) and printed, as the colophon states, at Valencia,—“A despeses de Alfonso Fernandez, comenzada en los mes de Febrer de l'any 1477, e acabada en los mes de Març de l'any

1478,"—thus, taking thirteen months to execute. The translator was Bonifacio Ferreiro; but we believe that, out of Spain, not a single copy exists.* We could indicate other recent discoveries of old translations in vulgar tongues, and some may, as yet, have escaped detection or notice.

In farther evidence of the solicitude of the Catholics to promote, rather than repress, the knowledge of the Scriptures, we refer to their strenuous exertions to disseminate the original texts, before the Protestants could claim an equal merit. So early as 1503, Cardinal Ximenes made preparations for publishing the magnificent Complutensian Polyglot, exhibiting the FIRST Christian edition of the Old Testament in Hebrew, (previously the work of Jews,) with the Chaldee paraphrase of the Pentateuch, and the FIRST IMPRESSIONS of the Septuagint and New Testament in Greek. The Old Testament was finished on the 10th July 1517, having been preceded by the New on the 10th January 1514—"In hac præclarissimâ Complutensi Universitate." To a Catholic university, therefore, and to a Spanish city, (Alcala de Henares,) is the Christian world indebted for this union of obligations.

In attributing the precedence of date to this Polyglot, we do not forget that the Septuagint was printed at the Aldine press at Venice in 1518,† and that the New Testament was edited by Erasmus at Basil in 1516, while we know that this Polyglot did not appear until 1520, or 1522, after the cardinal's death; but, as it was first printed, we assign it the priority, and, at all events, the whole of these primary editions emanated from Catholics. The Polyglot by Ximenes, and the New Testament by Erasmus, were inscribed to Leo X.

Mr. Pettigrew, in his catalogue of the library of the Duke of Sussex, cites a letter from Dr. Adam Clarke, on the merits of this great work, in which that learned person says—"I conclude that the Hebrew, Septuagint, Vulgate, Chaldee as far as it goes, and the original of the New Testament, are, as they stand in the Complutensian Polyglot, equal, in critical value, to manuscripts of these texts and versions of the tenth or twelfth centuries, or even higher." Lelong (*Biblioth. Sacra*, p. 11)

* The work of Gab. Diosdado Raym, "De primâ Typographiæ Hispanicæ Ætate," Romæ 1793, 4to.; and, "Typographia Española," by F. Mendez, Madrid, 1796, 4to. may be usefully consulted on early Spanish printing, a subject not incurious, though comparatively neglected.

† The elder Aldus died in 1515, but during the non-age of his sons, the establishment was conducted by their grandfather, Andrea Torresano, or Asulanus, whose daughter Aldus had married in 1500, and who printed this Septuagint.—(*Renouard Annales des Aldes*, Paris, 1825.) An imperfect copy of the New Testament, by Erasmus, (1516) on vellum, sold at Sir Mark Sykes' sale for 140*l*.

makes them even coeval with the seventh or eighth centuries. On receiving from the printer the concluding volume, the Cardinal exclaimed—"Grates tibi ago, summe Christe, quod rem magnopere a me curatam ad optatum finem perduxeris;" and, addressing those around him, added, "Nihil est, amici, de quo magis gratulari mihi debeatis, quam de hâc biblicorum editione, quæ una sacros religionis nostræ fontes, tempore perquam necessario, aperit." Six hundred copies, at the price of two and a half crowns of gold, constituted the edition, with three on vellum, one of which, bought in 1789, at the Pinelli sale, by Count M'Carthy of Toulouse, for £483,—the largest sum ever paid, up to that period, in England, for a set of books—was purchased at the Count's sale in 1817, for £644, by Mr. Hibbert; when Dr. Dibdin (*Library Companion*, p. 7) truly observed, that it was hardly possible to view these volumes, without feeling a justifiable pride, that they were the property of an Englishman. In our estimation, and under every combination of the elements of value, they constitute the most precious of existing books.*

To the first edition of the New Testament by Erasmus, in 1516, succeeded three others, in 1519, 1522, and 1527; and Daniel Bomberg, who printed the Hebrew Bible at Venice, both for Jews and Christians, had also published four editions, in 1517 (or 5278, Jewish chronology), 1521, 1525, and 1533, (that of 1528 being very dubious), before the first, by a Protestant,† Sebastian Munster, appeared in 1534-5. Again, in 1569-1572, a second Polyglot was edited at Antwerp, under the auspices of Philip II of Spain, prior to any similar enterprize on the part of Protestants; and the standard edition of the Septuagint has long been that of Rome, 1587—"ex auctoritate Sixti Quinti." The manuscript, which was its model, is now, we are happy to learn, under inspection for a new edition. Nor is Father Houbigant's Hebrew Bible (*Paris*, 1753, 4 vols. folio)

* See *Seb. Seemlerius, de Bibliis, Complutensibus Polyglottis*, Ingold. 1785, 4to. One of the ablest coadjutors of the Cardinal, was Stunica (Jacobus Lopez), a doctor of the University, whom Ximenes despatched to Rome in search of manuscripts, &c., of which journey he has left a rare volume—*Itinerarium, dum Compluto Romam proficisceretur*, in 4to. His altercations with Erasmus exposed him to the shafts of ridicule, not only of Erasmus, but of Ulrich Von Hütten, who assigned him a prominent place in the celebrated *Litteræ Obscurorum Virorum*. He died at Naples in 1530.

† Concerning these, and the earlier Jewish editions, in various cities of Italy, (Soncino, Ferrara, Brescia, Cremona, Naples, and Venice), the numerous publications of John Bernard de Rossi are the best authorities; more especially his *Annales Hebræo-typographici, seculi xv*, Parmæ, 1795-1799, 2 parts, 4to., and the Catalogue of his Library, *Libri stampati di Letteratura Ebraica, &c.*, Parma, 1812, in 8vo. For Bomberg's editions, in particular, see *Annales Hebræo-typographici*, vol. ii. p. 28.

wholly eclipsed by the more recent one of Dr. Kennicott, notwithstanding the Rev. Mr. Horne's depreciation of the learned Oratorian's labours. In the *Bibliographical Appendix* to the second volume of his *Introduction to the Study of the Scriptures*, p. 7, Mr. Horne asserts, "that Houbigant's edition has not answered the high expectations entertained of it," and refers, in evidence, to the *Bibliotheca Sussexiana*, p. 192-194; but these pages contain no mention of the work; and, when adverted to at pages 202-204, it is in terms of marked praise.—"This Bible is an invaluable treasure to every biblical reader," is the forcible expression used. Dr. Kennicott also affirms, that it claims for its worthy author the applause of all friends of religion and learning. Nor is Dr. Dibdin less laudatory, designating it "a splendid monument of individual labour and learning, and of corporate liberality; for the Fathers of the Oratory were at the expense of the publication." (*Classics*, vol. i. p. 79.) The edition was confined to five hundred copies, (Mr. Butler, *Horæ Biblicæ*, vol. i. p. 117, erroneously says, three hundred) which, independently of its intrinsic worth, has enhanced its price. The excellent prolegomena, prefaces, and notes, were separately published in 1777, 2 vols. 4to. at Frankfort, by Professor Bahrdt, (*Notæ Criticæ in Universos Veteris Testamenti libros, &c.*)

To this enumeration of the original texts of the Scriptures, we shall add a statement of the Bibles, or portions of the Bible, published between 1500 and 1536, extracted by the Rev. Mr. Townley from Panzer's *Annales Typographici*, (11 vols. 4to. *Norimb.* 1793-1803.) Within that interval, there appeared—1 Polyglot Bible (the Complutensian),—8 Hebrew, with 50 detached parts,—12 Greek Testaments, and 4 minor portions,—3 Old Testaments, and 3 Psalters, in Greek,—106 Latin Bibles, and 95 separate books of the Old Testament,—62 New Testaments, and 38 parts, in Latin,—15 Belgic Bibles, and 64 parts, (chiefly at Antwerp)—12 Italian Bibles, and 28 minor portions,—1 English Bible, 2 New Testaments, and 3 extracts from the Old,—2 New Testaments in Danish, and 7 parts,—the Evangelists in Hungarian, and the Psalter in Ethiopian; while 2 New Testaments, 1 Psalter, and 1 volume of the Penitential Psalms, constitute the whole of German contributions to the list, which certainly is an error. Altogether, the number of volumes amounts, Mr. Townley says, to 568 Bibles, or portions thereof. But there are considerable omissions: for Archbishop Newcombe, in his *View of the English Translations of the Bible*, pp. 387-411, makes the English publications, within that period, twenty-three; of which, however, one only was the whole Bible (Coverdale's). A comparison of Panzer, also, with *Ebert's Lexicon* (already noticed), will confirm the

remark of Brunet in his *Manuel du Libraire*,—"Cet ouvrage laisse encore beaucoup à désirer; surtout par rapport aux éditions de 1501 à 1536, dont il ne contient pas la moitié." If, notwithstanding, we add to Panzer's recital, the publications of the same character in the preceding period, 1450 (when, or near it, the Mazarine Bible was printed) to 1500, we shall have an accumulation of certainly not less than a thousand; and, of them, at least eight hundred preceded Luther's German Bible in 1534, which forms the era of Protestantism, in connexion and concurrence with the Bible. A thousand editions of that age were, probably, equal in expense to five thousand of the present day; for, as Mr. Townley observes—"the trade required large capitals; paper, and other materials, being exceedingly dear, and the readers but few." (vol. ii. p. 119.)

And we must observe, that not more than eighteen, of the five hundred and sixty-eight biblical articles, proceeded from England, Sweden, Denmark, or their dependencies, comprising all the Protestant monarchies of Europe, which certainly had become so without the aid of the Bible; for the solitary English volume did not appear until after the change of religion in England; and in 1536, no Bible existed in the other Protestant kingdoms. On the other hand, the four-fifths of these early scriptural productions issued from Italy, France, Belgium, and other parts, which have continued faithful to Catholicism;—a striking evidence that the Reformation extended not its influence where the light of Scripture had most beamed. By Catholics, then, we may confidently repeat, the sacred deposit was preserved during a succession of ages, amidst the ruins of time, the catastrophes of nature, and the assaults of men. By them its more enlarged circulation was promoted through the mighty agency of the press, of which it was the first mature production. By them, again, the original fountains of divine truth were opened to Christendom; and while the more educated were abundantly supplied with the bread of life in the language which they habitually read, the few readers, whose knowledge was confined to their native tongue, were not, as we have seen, unprovided for. And calumny has been our retribution! "Quidam quo plus debent, magis oderunt."—(*Seneca, Epist.* 19.)*

* No stronger proof can be produced of bad passions, than the calumnies heaped on the Catholic Bishops of Ireland, in relation to *Peter Dens*, whose work, veiled in the obscurity of a learned language, as Gibbon said of the *Aviôdôra* of Procopius, (vol. iv. 53), and, therefore, inaccessible to the great body of the people, even if injurious in its tenor, has been disseminated in partial versions, as if to produce the evil purpose, which was so shamelessly attributed to it. We could name various Protestant volumes, not more pure in subject or language, and by divines of known virtue; nor would it be difficult to indicate similar passages in Holy Writ which

Next to the inspired writers, and as their natural expounders, the holy Fathers claim our veneration. And here, it will be found, that either the first or the best editions, generally both, are due to Catholics; for every Latin father, without exception, and nearly all the Greek, reckon Catholics for their first publishers; and the Benedictine editions of both are, beyond all comparison, the most valued. We can appreciate the labours of Thirlby, Jebb, Potter, Mangey, Grabe, and some living German editors, which, however, no one will place on a parallel line with those of Montfaucon, Mabillon, Martianay, Ruinart, Thierry, Garnier, and other Benedictines, to whom we are indebted for the best editions of Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Origen, Cyprian, Athanasius, Hilary, Cyril, Basil, John Chrysostom, with many minor collections, among the Greeks. And of the Latins, we owe to their zeal and industry, Ambrose, Jerome, Prosper, Augustin, Gregory, Cassiodorus, Bernard, &c. Amongst the other orders of the Church we could also select names associated, in the most eminent degree, with the propagation and elucidation of Holy Writ.

Having offered this series of facts, in vindication of the Catholic Church, from the imputation of hostility to the Bible, we shall endeavour to show, that the communication of the sacred volume to the people did not, as has been pretended, generate the Reformation; for, in nine-tenths of the European states, no popular version existed when they embraced Protestantism; and, unless effect in this case foreran cause, it could not have been the parent of its predecessor.

According to Malte-Brun,* a geographer of the highest authority, (*Universal Geography*, vol. vi. p. 79), the Catholic population of Europe embraces ninety-eight or ninety-nine millions—the Protestant, forty-three or forty-four, including all denominations. Lutheranism is professed in the two Saxonys, Wirtenberg, Hesse, and other provinces of Germany, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, the Baltic provinces of Russia, and Prussia. Calvinism sways Western Germany, some cantons of Switzerland, Holland, and Scotland; while the Anglican Church is nearly confined to England; “but its oppression,” adds the Protestant writer,

present similar difficulties. St. John Chrysostom truly says, that, on such occasions, we should distinguish the writer's motives—*whether founded in impurity of feelings, or anxiety to correct.*—(In Comment. in Epist. ad Thessalon.)

* His name was Malthe-Conrad Bruun, which the French, who, like the Greeks, accommodate foreign sounds to their fastidious ears, transformed to Malte-Brun. He was a native of Norway, and well entitled to be called the modern D'Anville. His merits are well expressed by a most competent judge—M. Louis Reybaud—“La Géographie est arrivée à Malte-Brun, qui le premier l'a embrassée à la fois dans ses détails, et dans son ensemble.”

"is severely felt in Ireland." Now, we shall show, that of all these countries, Holland alone, and a few cities in Germany, were in possession of the Bible, when they adopted the reformed creed; and to this diminished sphere must, of consequence, the action of the Bible be restricted in producing its alleged fruit. Far different, indeed, were its results! For Protestantism, whose pretext was reform, and object spoliation, came, as it were, to a full stop, just as the Scriptures obtained a wider circulation. So little, in truth, did the more diffused use of the Bible second the novel doctrine, that, for nearly three centuries, elapsed since the death of Luther in 1546, (with the sole exception of Holland, and some districts of Germany,) it cannot reckon the accession of a single European people. The Reformation reached, at first bound, its culminating point; and its early triumphs, like those of the Macedonian empire, marked its ultimate confines. The life of Luther was commensurate with its growth, and terminated its conquests.

In demonstrating the prior establishment of the reformation, in almost every country that embraced it, to the existence, and, consequently, to the influence of the bible, we shall adopt the dates assigned by the Rev. Mr. Horne to each national version, in the "Bibliographical Appendix to his Introduction to the Study of the Scriptures." We shall begin with Great Britain, the recognized head and protagonist of Protestantism; premising that our reference to the bible implies the collective body of the scriptures, unmutated by division—the word of God in unimpaired integrity, such as the advocates of its unrestricted circulation so loudly challenge, and such as our reverend guide, than whom a less objectionable one could not surely be named, contemplated in the chronological list to which we have adverted. It was with a consonant feeling, that the fourth of October 1835 was celebrated as the anniversary of the *completion* of Coverdale's bible—*fyinished*, as expressed in the colophon, the *fourthe daye* of October, 1535; and it was similarly, that Bugenhagen commemorated the day on which Luther *consummated* his translation, in which Bugenhagen had been an active assistant, by an annual entertainment, "conducted," says his biographer, "with cheerful gravity, and not the anterior emission of any detached part."—Mr. Townley, vol. ii. p. 283.

The first English bible, usually called Coverdale's, though not *his* sole achievement, is intituled, "Biblia, the Bible, that is, the Holy Scripture of the Olde and Newe Testament, faithfully and truly translated out of Douche and Latyn into Englishe. . . . Prynted in the year of our Lorde, MDXXXV., and fyinished the

fourth day of October." (*Biblioth. Spenc.* vol. i. p. 78.)* No claim is here put forward, it will be observed, of derivation from, or collation of, the original texts; the Douche probably implying Luther's version, and the Latyn the Vulgate. Coverdale, in his address to Henry VIII, makes mention of the king's dearest and just wife, *Jane*, whose marriage did not take place until the 20th May, 1536; so that the publication of the volume, printed, it is supposed at Zurich, certainly abroad, was posterior to this date. Assuming, however, the prior one of October 1535, the third centennial anniversary of which was lately solemnized, as the birth-day and congenital origin of the Reformation in this realm, we pronounce the association an anachronism and preposterous; for it is perfectly ascertained, that England had previously abjured the communion of Rome, or, in equivalent terms, embraced Protestantism. An act, passed the 30th of March, 1534, had abolished the power of the Pope within the kingdom; and in the ensuing month of November, "the decisive act," says Mr. Sharon Turner (*Henry VIII*, p. 571), "was introduced, annulling for ever the papal supremacy, and enacting that the king shall be taken, accepted, and reputed the only supreme head of the Church of England." Other writers assign an anterior date to the separation, which, according to Mr. Townley, occurred in 1533; and in "*L'art de vérifier les dates*" (tome vii. p. 391) it is stated, "Le parlement d'Angleterre déclara que le roi est le chef suprême de l'église, le 16 Janvier, 1531; but we have followed Hume (iv. p. 136), Lingard (vi. p. 113), Hallam (i. p. 189), and *Statutes of the Realm* (vol. iii. p. 492-508). And the schism, rendered conclusive by the act of November, 1534, was sealed by numerous executions; amongst others, by that of Bishop Fisher on the 25th June, and of Sir Thomas More on the 6th July, 1535, which testified, in characters of purest blood, the renouncement of the communion of Rome, and consequent establishment of Protestantism, previous to the publication of the first English bible.†

* See also Mr. Lowndes's "Bibliographer's Manual," p. 168, *et seq.* Lewis, Newcombe, Todd, Townley, Horne, and others, have minutely described this volume, of which even a repaired copy produced eighty-five guineas at Mr. Dent's sale in 1827. The third volume of David Clément's "Bibliographie Curieuse," Gottingue, 1750-1760. 9 volumes 4to. (a work left imperfect by his death, and of great research for that period), may be consulted likewise with advantage, at p. 415, &c.

† The first Catholic bible, in English, was printed at Douay, in 1609, 2 vols. 4to. preceded by the New Testament, at Rheims, in 1582. This bible was reprinted at Rouen in 1635, 2 vols. 4to. where it is described as the result of forty years' toil and labour, "in consequence of the poor state of the college in banishment." Great sympathy is always expressed for Tyndale, Rogers, Coverdale, and others, who were driven to print their translations abroad; to which our sole objection is, its limitation to party, and consequent absence of principle. Why preclude the Catholic exiles

Several editions followed, in 1537, 1538, 1539, & 1540, &c.*; but so faint was the impression produced on the popular mind, that, in July 1553, on Mary's accession to the throne, the kingdom resumed its old creed. In fact, as Mr. Hallam observes, (vol. i. p. 140), "Henry, Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth, found an almost equal compliance with their varying schemes of faith; and nothing could be more illusive than this multiplied emission of bibles; for such restrictions were immediately imposed on their possession or perusal, as to nullify their ostensible object—"the popular communication of the word of God." Like the sumptuary laws, the permission was graduated according to rank; for "no women, not gentle or noble, nor artificers, prentices, journeymen, &c. were to read the Bible, or New Testament, in English, to himself, or to any other, privately or openly."† (Stat. of 33 Henry VIII, cap. 12.) Strype, quoted by Mr. Townley, (vol. ii. p. 400), says, that "parsons, vicars, and curates, did read so confusedly the word of God. . . . humming and hawking thereat, that no man could understand, &c." A considerable number of churches were left without the bible; and, in others, it was placed where no poor man could presume to come. (*Newcombe*, p. 53, and *Lewis*, p. 141.). The price, too, fixed by Henry at ten shillings unbound, or twelve shillings bound, equivalent to nearly as many pounds of present currency, rendered scriptural reading, again, similar to the law of divorce, available only to the rich; nor, we believe, was a small or cheap edition, in form or price, published until 1549 (by Daye). These obstacles and inhibitions were subsequently renewed and rigorously enforced at various times. A decree of the Star Chamber, of 1st July 1637, ordered "that the printers shall be reduced to a certain number, and that if any other shall pursue the trade, he shall be set in the pillory, or whipped through the streets."

Scotland had no national version until 1579, when appeared

from the same good feeling; for they, surely, were not more intolerant in creed, or rebels in law? For every obnoxious note in that bible, we could most easily find a parallel in the Protestant theologians of that day; and had not Cranmer and Ridley, the former with characteristic duplicity, but Ridley with bold assertion, upheld, as expressed by Mr. Hallam (vol. i. p. 133), the usurpation of Lady Jane against Mary? This Catholic bible was, as indeed were all Catholic books, rigidly interdicted; yet Catholics are accused of not reading the scriptures—"et secum petulans amentia certat."—*Claudian*.

* Mr. Hallam's estimate of the character of Cranmer, by whose name the bible of 1540 is called, is obviously conveyed in the words which he ascribes to Bossuet, "in whose bitter invective," he says, "the patriarch of our reformed churches stands forth as the most abandoned of time-serving hypocrites." (Vol. i. p. 132.)

† "Adeo imparē libertatem Romæ diti ac pauperi, honorato atque inhonorato esse." (Livy, lib. xxvi. cap. 2.) "There is one law for the rich, and one for the poor in Ireland," was the similar expression of Lord Chancellor Redesdale, early in this century.

"The Bible and Holy Scriptures contained in the Olde and Newe Testament, printed in Edinburg be Alexander Arbuthnot, Printer to the Kingis Maieste." (*Ædes Althorp*. i. p. 29.) But, nearly twenty years before, Calvinism had supplanted the ancient faith; for an act passed in 1560, at the instigation of Knox, to whom, as to Satan himself, "one mass was more fearful than 10,000 armed enemies" (Macrie's *Life of Knox*, vol. ii. p. 24,) made the exercise of the Catholic worship penal, in the merciful gradation of forfeiture of goods, exile, and death. (*Robertson*, i. p. 206.) Dr. Macrie pleasurably dwells on the fruits of biblical reading; but we may learn from history, how far it enlarged the charities and enlightened the minds of Knox and his followers.

In the Highlands, the change of religion foreran its alleged cause by above two centuries; for the first Gaelic bible bears the very recent date of 1802; nor had even the New Testament appeared before 1767, when Dr. Johnson's letter of August 13, 1766, to Mr. W. Drummond (*Croker's edition of Boswell*, vol. ii. p. 27) wrested a reluctant permission for the publication of Dr. Stewart's version, from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, who had previously opposed it, lest it should encourage the use of the native dialect.*

The instrument of conversion, in the islands of Scotland, was the *yellow stick*, with which Maclean, the laird of Rum, and others, drove their tenants to the kirk. In 1609, says the late Mr. Donald Gregory (*History of the Western Isles*, &c. 1836), the bishops of the Isles, in a meeting held at Iona, and attended by a kind of congress of insular chiefs, passed the statutes of Icolmkill, which established the reformed Kirk of Scotland.

The Welsh were without a bible until 1588, or fifty years posterior to the creed which it was said ~~they have~~ taught them; nor did a native version appear in the Isle of Man before 1763, though the Reformation had been established there above two centuries.*

All the dependencies of England bowed in passive submission to her will and example, save Ireland, whose resistance to this dictation entailed on her people ages of unrelenting persecution. Reserved for final prey, they had to endure the treatment of the last of slaves." Παύθησαν τ' ἂν δεινότερα ἢ οἱ πρὶν δουλόντες (*Thucyd.*) or, in the words of Galgacus to the Caledonians,

* Ebert ("Allgemeines Bibliographisches Lexicon," No. 22,703) says, that Queen Elizabeth's copy of the Welch New Testament (London, 1567, 4to.), is in the royal library of Dresden, of which he is curator, and which contains, as before stated, 260,000 printed, and 2700 manuscript, volumes. (Balbi, *Essai*, &c.)

“ac, sicut in familia recentissimus quisque servorum eto conservis ludibrio est, sic nos *ut* viles in excidium petimur.”—(*Taciti Agricola*.) George Brown, created archbishop of Dublin in 1535, “purged the churches, pulled down images,” says Mosheim (*Ecclesiastical History*, vol. iv. p. 137) “and caused the king’s supremacy to be acknowledged in Ireland.” But this legislative or episcopal enforcement produced no native bible; for none appeared until 1685, when one, executed some years before, at the desire of Bedel, bishop of Dromore, was published. Burnet, in his life of that prelate, on relating the circumstance, takes occasion to represent the bible as “a book always so fatal to the Church of Rome.” Our readers may have noticed how far this fatal influence was experienced elsewhere; and its contrary effect in Ireland is abundantly notorious.

In Germany, according to the Rev. Mr. Horne, Luther’s translation was completed in 1534; but, before that year, almost every Protestant state of the present day had espoused the new creed. In 1525, on the death of Frederic the Wise, of Saxony, who protected the person without adopting the doctrine of Luther, his brother and successor, John, ordered a body of laws to be drawn up by Luther and Melancthon, which served as a precedent for the other princes, who, at the second diet of Spire, on the 29th April, 1529, subscribed the famous protest, whence sprung the designation of Protestants; for the distinction of *reformer* was not assumed until some years after by the Calvinists (*Mosheim*, century xvi.) Robertson (*Charles V*, vol. ii.) places the reception of Lutheranism, in the various states, in the year 1525; and so early as 1522, the furious Carlostadt had incited the people of Wittenberg to the wonted outrages on Catholic worship and monuments; for which he was reproved by Luther, who, in the words of Mosheim’s translator, Dr. Maclaine, “could not bear to see another crowned with the glory of executing a plan which himself had laid.” (*Mosheim*, vol. iv. p. 59.) Luther was indeed little tolerant of the aberrations of his fellow-reformers in conduct or doctrine. “His *golden rule*,” as Mosheim designates it, allowed no latitude of interpretation to the word of scripture—one sense only; and that sense was, of course, his own. The portraiture of the great reformer, as exhibited by himself, in the late compilation of M. Michelet (*Mémoires de Martin Luther*, &c. 1836), is no flattering representation. It is not a seemly image, or attractive object of contemplation, for, on his own evidence, it is difficult to pronounce him sane of mind; of which, indeed, Mr. Hallam (vol. i. p. 80) seems fully aware. But his mastery of the human will—“that spell upon the mind of man”—is sufficient demonstration of his genius.

He was one of those commanding spirits, "un de ces esprits remuans et audacieux," as the eloquent Bossuet paints Cromwell, "qui semblent nés pour changer le monde."

In April, 1525, according to the compilers of "*L'Art de Vérifier les Dates*," Albert of Brandenburg, Grand Master of the Teutonic Order, seized on the duchy of Prussia, expelled the Catholics, and committed such outrages, that even the Protestant princes joined in a confederacy to atrest his violence; but, whether the language of the people was Polish or Luthuanian, we know that no bible existed in the former before 1561 (Mr. Horne says 1596), nor in the latter until 1560. The famous Socinian version, at the cost of Prince Radzivil, in Polish, appeared in 1563.

The light of the Reformation, writes Mosheim (vol. iv. p. 81), was received in Denmark so early as 1521, by Christiern II, "a monarch," he adds, "whose savage and infernal cruelty rendered his name odious, and his memory execrable; but who, nevertheless, was desirous of delivering his dominions from the superstition and tyranny of Rome." After some alternations of success and defeat, the final overthrow of Catholicism was effected in 1536; but the nation was already nearly all Lutheran, under Christiern III. The Catholic clergy were made the victims of persecution; and the bishop of Roschild died in irons after various sufferings. (*Universal History*, vol. xxxii. p. 400.) It was not, however, until 1550, that the first Danish bible was printed, at Copenhagen, by Hans Mikketon, in folio. Norway, Iceland, and all the dependencies of Denmark, obediently moved in the train of that kingdom, and adopted, as commanded, the new doctrines, though no bible existed in the Norse dialect before 1584; and the earliest Icelandic bears the same date. (*D. Clément, Bibliographie Curieuse*, tom. iv.) Mr. Laing could discover no bible in Lapland, when he lately visited that hyperborean region, though long professedly Protestant; for which, however, he naturally accounts, as very few could read; but an edition was published, in 1811, at Hernsvand, 3 volumes quarto; of course too dear for so poor a people, even if capable of reading it.

Mosheim says, that the Reformation was propagated in Sweden soon after Luther's rupture with Rome. In 1528, Gustavus Vasa made public profession of Lutheranism; and, the following year, the Confession of Augsburg was adopted by a decree of a national council held at Orebro (*L'Art de Vérifier les Dates*, tom. viii. p. 225). Vertot affirms that, in 1527, all Sweden was Protestant; but the first Swedish bible is dated in 1541, printed at Upsal, "juxta versionem Martini

Lutheri," which version everywhere was the model and original of all Protestant translations in the north of Europe.

The Russian provinces of the Baltic became Lutheran contemporaneously with, and at the dictation of, Sweden and Denmark; but no Livonian or Esthonian bible appeared until 1689, nor in the Finnish tongue before 1642. The oldest Slavonian bible bears date—"die 12mo Aprilis, 1581—in urbe Ostrobia" (*Biblioth. Spenc.* i. p. 90; and *Clement.* iv. p. 441.)

The first of the Swiss cantons that separated from Rome was Zurich, where Zuinglius, it is asserted, had even preceded Luther in the march of reform. In 1524, according to Mr. Planta, (*History of the Helvetic Confederation*, vol. ii. 371) the new opinions were generally adopted. Mr. Townley places the change in 1523 (vol. ii. p. 356); but Ruchet (*Histoire de la Réformation de Suisse*, tom. i. p. 136-158) fixes it in April 1525. Zuinglius was slain at the battle of Cappel in 1531, fighting against the Catholics.

Berne embraced the scheme of Zuinglius in February 1528; and the cities of Schaffhausen and Basil quickly followed the precedent (*Planta*, ii. p. 385.) Glaris and Apenzil admitted both creeds; being the sole instance, with an evanescent exception in Denmark, of this toleration, until the civil wars of France temporarily closed with the Edict of Nantes in 1598.

The remaining cantons of Switzerland adhered to the ancient faith, on which the first appearance of a bible in the Helvetic idiom in 1529, produced no adverse impression; for not one of the cantons became Protestant after its publication. Amongst the French allies, Calvinism was not formally established at Geneva before 1535, nor at Neuchâtel until the ensuing year (*Art de Vérifier les Dates*, tom. xiv.); but the first bible for the use of the French districts, nominally the work of Olivetan, but principally by Calvin, though bearing the impress of 1535, was not, in reality, concluded or published until 1537. We have also seen, that the dates of the Complutensian Polyglot, and of Coverdale's Bible, preceded their publication; which, most probably, was the case with many others. The first Grison bible appeared in 1657.

Thus, then, Holland alone, with some cities of Germany, as we have stated, can, by possibility, be supposed to owe the Reformation to the perusal of the Bible by the people; for there only, had it pre-existed in the vulgar tongue. The Old Testament was printed at Delft in 1477, but deficient of the psalms, which, with the New Testament, subsequently appeared. Yet, of the seventeen provinces, in whose language, and for whose use, this translation was made, the majority have not swerved

from the Catholic creed; and the tyranny of Spain will sufficiently account for the alienation of the others, without recurring to the agency of the bible. In Germany, likewise, popular versions had numerous appeared, at Mentz, Cologne, Bamberg, Augsburg, Nuremberg, Lubeck, Ulm, and Strasbourg; but of these towns many are still Catholic.

The reading of the Scripture, therefore, has not promoted Protestantism; while the ancient faith, yet eminently predominant, reckons in its bosom more than double the number of dissidents of all descriptions; and, responsive to its distinctive character, still maintains a sway commensurate with its appropriate designation of Catholic or universal.

The comparative advance of Catholicism is, indeed, most striking; as may be deduced from unquestionable authority. "About the year 1530," Mosheim complacently asserts, that "the dawn of truth spread itself far and wide; and almost all the European states welcomed its salutary ray." Robertson, and other writers, represent the empire of both religions as nearly balanced in the sixteenth century, as does Schiller in the next age (*Geschichte des Dreyssigjährigen Kriegs, passim*); but it is far otherwise at the present day, as we have seen from Malte Brun; and the disproportion is constantly enlarging. The Catholic population of Germany is now, according to that geographer, 17,906,500, or within a fraction of eighteen millions, while the Protestants hardly exceed twelve (12,032,000). In Bohemia, where the latter were even supposed to preponderate, during, or before, the thirty years' war, the existing proportion he represents as only one to thirty-three, compared to the Catholics. Yet, this is the country which, Mr. Strang assures us, had enjoyed seven editions of a popular bible previous to Luther's,* and where John Huss, Jerome of Prague, and the ferocious Zisca, were supposed to have sown the good seed, whence such mighty fruit was to germinate. Even in Holland, the increase of Catholicism is remarkable; for, according to a census taken within the last twelve months, the seven ecclesiastical districts, into which it is divided, contain nearly 900,000 Catholics, or more than one-third of the entire population. The Catholics of the United States have advanced in a quintuple ratio since 1800.

* We cannot discover this number in our best bibliographical authorities, necessarily the surest on such questions. See Ebert's Lexicon, No. 2137 et seq. The earliest edition is of 1488, followed by another in 1489, and two or three later in date. Mr. Strang probably included some editions of the New Testament in his enumeration, (the first of which appeared in 1475) or some other partial publication, which it was not unusual to distinguish as the *Bible*, until of late years, when greater accuracy of research established the difference.

But, probably, our own empire exhibits the most pregnant evidence of Catholic growth. The metropolis, we may assert, now contains a number nearly equal to what existed in all England, on the accession of George III, in 1760. Liverpool, Manchester, Bristol, &c., display an equal advance; which we must observe, is always most conspicuous where industry is most flourishing. In June, 1836, a committee reported to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, "that about a century ago, Popery was confined to the remote districts of the country, but now splendid churches were rapidly rising for the celebration of its idolatrous worship; and Glasgow," it is added, "contains more Catholics than existed in all Scotland in 1679." (*Annual Register* for 1836.) It is, we believe, incontestable, that the Catholic inhabitants of the three kingdoms now outnumber any other religious denomination; and daily reports place beyond controversy their rapid propagation in the British colonies.

Ireland, however, presents to our view the most steady progression, and effective strength of Catholicism. Swift, about a century ago, looked, as he said, upon the Irish Catholics, "altogether as inconsiderable, or powerless, as women and children. Popery," he added, "must crumble away; the Popish priests are all registered, and can have no successors," &c. And so late as 1780, Burke, in addressing the electors of Bristol, calculated the Catholics of Ireland at sixteen to seventeen hundred thousand, with an assurance that he did not exaggerate the number! In 1731, the Catholic residents of the Queen's County were computed at 16,000, while the Protestants reckoned 1,900; but, in 1831, after a lapse of a century, according to the census of that year, the former amounted to 64,225, and the latter had dwindled to 1,400;—nor is this an unfair specimen of the growing disproportion.

Another important association of the new doctrines challenges attention. It is, that their advance was in the inverse direction of existing civilization, of which Italy was the undisputed centre; for it was in proportion as the alleged reform receded from the proximity or influence of intellectual culture, that it met acceptance. In Italy, France, Spain, Portugal, the southern provinces of Germany, and the Netherlands, then the most enlightened portion of Europe, it was generally repelled, while it was unhesitatingly embraced by the barbarians of Scandinavia. That was, indeed, the golden age of Italy, under Leo X.; of France, under the *Father of Letters*; of Spain and the provinces of Burgundy, under Charles V; and of Portugal, ruled by Emmanuel: but the regions of the north, when they so promptly

enlisted under the banners of Luther; were sunk in most unlettered rudeness. Not only had not the bible appeared in their respective tongues, but not a single author of antiquity, unless possibly in extracts or selections for mere elementary instruction, had been published in any one of these easy conquests of the Reformation—facts sufficiently illustrative, it must be conceded, both of the non-influence of scriptural reading in generating reform, and of the absence of the acknowledged sources of cultivated education in these nations.

Nor was this evidence of illiteracy less striking in England, where, with the exception of some detached portions, for the use of schools, of Virgil, Terence, or Cicero, no classic had issued from the press. The edition of the younger Pliny, which had been imposed upon Dr. Askew, as printed at Oxford in 1469 by F. Corsellis, was soon pronounced spurious (*Biblioth. Spenc.* ii. 271); but, even for many years subsequent to the Reformation, no complete edition of a Greek or Roman author appears to have been printed in Great Britain. Indeed, we are not sure that any Greek volume preceded the New Testament of 1592; nor, until 1663, the date of Stanley's *Æschylus*, had the nation produced a critical, or a *fitable* edition of any classic author; though we are not insensible of the value of Sir H. Saville's *St. John Chrysostom*, in 1613. (See *Beloe's Anecdotes of Literature*, vol. v.)

To Catholic Europe, on the other hand, we are indebted for every extant Latin classic, from the Offices of Cicero in 1465, to the Phædrus of 1596, as well as for nearly all the Greek authors, beginning, as is meet, with the Florentine Homer of 1488—"the first in birth, the first in fame." If literature derived any advantage from the Reformation in England, the fruit, assuredly, was of slow growth. In 1603, when the University of Oxford addressed James the First on his accession to the throne, Dr. Thorpe could find no Hebrew types to express, as Hebrew professor, his gratulations. "*Sed enim typographo decrant characteres*," was his excuse; and this, be it observed, occurred in the *first* Protestant kingdom and university of Europe, almost a century after the Hebrew Bible had been printed in Spain, and one hundred and fifteen years posterior to its publication in Italy, in 1488. (*Bibl. Spenc.* vol. i. p. 75.)

It has long been a hacknied phrase and assumed position, that the discovery of printing had been a main instrument of the Reformation. That this mighty engine imparted a powerful movement to every spring of human action, and excited one of those paroxysms of restlessness, which threaten or produce revolution, must be admitted; but, that it gave any moral impulse,

or, that the light it diffused lent any aid to the new doctrines,¹ is contradicted by the incontrovertible fact, that they succeeded least where the art was most cultivated. Not only previous to, but for no short interval after, the Reformation, the presses of Italy and France were in teeming activity, when "few, and far between," were the productions of the great Protestant kingdoms, which altogether, were inferior in number, during the entire sixteenth century, to those of the single city of Venice. Nor would a comparison of these collective monarchies, comprising nearly the whole territorial sway of Protestantism in that age, with other Catholic cities, such as Paris* or Rome, offer a less decisive testimony of the little sympathy between the Reformation and the great invention, which cannot, in reason, be imagined most favourable where least encouraged. Repelled by the most enlightened nations of Europe, it was where the influence of the press, at once the cause and result of that superiority, was, from its narrow compass of action, inconsiderable, or nearly unknown, that the new creed found the most welcome access. Hume, though he supports the pretended alliance, fairly adds, "that the rapid advance of the Lutheran doctrine, and the violence with which it was embraced, prove sufficiently that it owed not its success to reason and reflection."

ART. VIII.—1. *Annual Reports of the Agent for Emigrants at Quebec, printed by order of the House of Commons, 1831 to 1836.*

2. *New York Shipping and Passenger Returns, 1826 to 1836.*

TO suppose that apology were necessary for bestowing a few thoughts upon such of Ireland's unhappy sons as have been driven by circumstances to seek a home in the new world, were, we feel satisfied, to imagine a libel, not merely on the Irish, but upon the British people also.

But few, however, of our readers are perhaps aware of the extent to which their best sympathies are due in this direction;

* In an edict, dated the 9th April, 1513, Louis XII thus expresses his views of the benefits of the press.—"En considération du grand bien qui est advenu en nostre royaume de l'art et science d'impression, l'invention de laquelle semble estre plus divine qu'humaine, par laquelle nostre foy catholique a este grandement augmentée et corroborée," &c. Such was the language of encouragement, just previously to the Reformation, which produced far different sentiments in his successors. (*Résumé historique de l'Introduction de l'imprimerie*, par M. Taillandier, 1837.) ●

and it is this reflection which has determined us to throw together such portion of our transatlantic experience as regards the "whereabout" of the Irish in America.

Men may be induced to emigrate to the new world,—the modern land of promise,—by motives which, although perhaps traceable to the same, or nearly the same metaphysical elements, are, in their effects, of very opposite character.

An ambitious and somewhat restless spirit, on the one hand—the usual concomitant of youth, health, and vigour, may excite hopes of success and good fortune in a new and wide field of exertion, which an old and thickly-peopled country scarcely offers to the most sanguine. This motive to emigrate is entirely of the attractive kind. The emotions with which it is accompanied are wholly pleasurable, and although the promises and expectations of youth are, we are told, but rarely fulfilled in age, it will not be disputed, that those exertions which are the offspring of confidence and self-reliance, go far indeed to ensure success and its consequent happiness.

A long course of misery and privation, on the other hand, is calculated to create a feeling of despair. All idea of securing any degree of comfort at home is banished. In such a case, emigration may be resorted to as a species of forlorn hope. Exertion being paralysed, mental elasticity destroyed, hope utterly extinguished, the unfortunate is induced to remove, not because he has any confidence in the future, but because his wretched condition being incapable of becoming worse, he is willing to tempt the chapter of accidents, on the chance, not in the hope, of a change for the better.

From countries other than Ireland, emigration may proceed from the first-named motive. Men may be induced to move by the hope of benefit. From Ireland, it proceeds, we regret to say, for the most part, from the last-named motive. The industrious peasant is driven to expatriate himself by the dread of impending evil. Persecution, both political and religious, (for, let no man say, that the latter does not exist where men have to pay double for the privilege of worshipping God after their own fashion), and poverty the most biting, are the chief expatriating causes in constant operation in Ireland.

America has, from time to time, afforded an asylum to Irishmen of the highest endowments and virtue, who have been unsuccessful in their attempts to resist the oppressions of the blighting oligarchy which it has been the insane policy of the British Government hitherto to uphold. We find "Irish rebels," (so called), and their descendants, now numbered amongst America's most honoured citizens. The name of Emmett for

instance, is to be found in connexion with high professional station,—with the bar, the medical profession, the professor's chair; and others of a similar character might be quoted.

But it is not of this small class that we have to speak. Our business, indeed, is not with individuals at all, it is with the industrious mass,—the thousands and tens of thousands, who are compelled by the poverty consequent upon a most vicious political and social state, to court fortune in a distant, and to them, unknown region. These we shall endeavour to trace to their new resting place, and noting the new circumstances by which they are surrounded, mark, so far as lies in our power, the changes which these new circumstances have brought about; and of some of which we have been a percipient witness.

The two principal points to which emigration from Europe, and especially from Ireland, is directed, are New York and Quebec, both convenient stopping places in the way to the "far west." Passengers are also landed at other ports, Boston and Philadelphia, for instance, in the United States, and St. John's, St. Andrew's, Halifax, &c., in the British provinces. But the numbers are inconsiderable, and, moreover, no regular returns are furnished.

Of the numbers landed at Québec and New York, during each of the eleven years ending in 1836, the following is a statement:—

Year.			Quebec.			New York.			
1826	}					4,225	}		
1827		-	-	23,160	-	7,077		-	40,126
1828						5,664			
1829	-	-	9,614	-	2,674	-	12,288		
1830	-	-	18,300	-	3,766	-	22,066		
1831	-	-	34,135	-	6,582	-	40,717		
1832	-	-	28,204	-	6,936	-	35,140		
1833	-	-	12,013	-	10,096	-	22,109		
1834	-	-	19,208	-	12,028*	-	31,236		
1835	-	-	7,108	-	8,825	-	15,933		
1836	-	-	12,596	-	15,135	-	27,731		
<hr/>									
Total from Ireland,	-		164,338	-		83,008	-	247,346	
From other countries,	-		113,803	-		258,862	-	372,665	
<hr/>									
Total from all places,	-		278,141	-		341,870	-	620,011	

* The New York return for the last three years is not classed, hence the numbers from Ireland are assumed at the average proportion. It may not be quite correct for any one year, but is most likely so for the three.

Of the total emigration into Canada, more than half, or fifty-nine-hundredths are from Ireland; of that into New York, the proportion is only one-fourth. This is easily accounted for. New York is a recipient for emigrants from every European country, whilst Canada receives but few from any other country than the British Isles. If the Irish and British settlers were compared at New York, it is probable the proportion would be nearly as large.

It is no part of our design to write a treatise on emigration, or to enumerate the evils incidental to the present mode of conducting it. Nevertheless, we cannot give an idea of the changes which take place in the condition of the settler, without touching briefly on these topics.

We must first remind the reader, that emigration from the United Kingdom is spontaneous. The law gives it no direction or impulse. It ordains, that the passenger shall have a certain amount of ship-room, and that there shall be on board the ship a certain quantity of some sort of food and of water; but farther than this, the law gives itself no concern. No attempt is made to encourage any, the most imperfect selection as to age, so as to render emigration in the highest degree efficient. As there is no certain provision in Ireland for the old, and the expense of their maintenance, therefore, falls upon the young,—with the young they must of course be removed. This must greatly enhance the difficulties which the industrious settler has to encounter and overcome. Neither does the law care for the condition of the settler after he has landed. For forty-eight hours has he the law's protection, after which, for aught the British law cares, he may perish.

This brings us to the first *phase* in the settler's new condition. At the ports of debarkation, there is a continual out-pouring of competitors for employment. As they are, for the most part, destitute in the first instance of the means of conveying themselves to those parts of the country—and these are fortunately every where—where their labour is in demand, they are compelled to bid against each other, and against the permanent labourers in the labour market, which, in consequence, perpetually exhibits the phenomenon of a glut of hands. Whilst there has been an actual scarcity of labour in many parts of the country—whilst £2. 10s., £3., and even £4. per month, with food, has been offered labourers by public advertisement, we have known a dainty servant glad to hire himself at 25s. per month, until he was able to save a few dollars to pay the cost of moving up the country, when he was fain to strip off his faded livery, and familiarise himself with the plough or the axe.

Though the labour markets at the ports of debarkation, and some of the principal stopping places, are thus perpetually overstocked, and wages constantly always comparatively low; the evil does not long afflict the individual. The wages, although low for a new country, are sufficiently high to admit of saving, so that, in a very short time, the recent immigrant begins to move into the interior, stopping and working as his funds run low, or as improved wages offer themselves.

In Canada this evil has been greatly mitigated, we may almost say removed, by a wise and benevolent enactment of the provincial legislature. By this act, a payment of 5s. per head is exacted from ships bringing passengers. The money thus collected is divided into four equal parcels, whereof two hospitals for the reception of emigrants respectively get a share, and the other two shares are assigned to the Emigrant Societies of Quebec and Montreal; being expended in forwarding recent immigrants to their final destination, and in occasional relief in case of distress.

The effect of this law is equivalent to a guarantee that every emigrant has the means of conveyance to the interior. The sum may seem small for the purpose; but let it be remembered that it is *an average sum* paid by all, but expended on a portion only,—namely, on the most destitute. Thus it fulfils its purpose.

Yet this law, admirable as it is, has its enemies, in all those who are engaged in what has been not inaptly called the *white slave trade*. We should be sorry to condemn a whole class, even though the majority should be proved to be base. There may be such phenomena as disinterested land jobbers, benevolent masters of passenger ships, and sentimental emigrant brokers; but, speaking generally, the constant contemplation of the filth, squalor, and misery of crowded passenger ships, seems to blunt the gentler sympathies, and the whole tribe of those who extract profits out of emigration, see in the above law only an abridgement of their gains. They raise a cry of “animosity to emigration,” they mendaciously attribute it to the “French party,” though they know it was the proposal and work of Englishmen. But their efforts have fortunately been of no avail. The “tax,” as they delight to call it, continues to work its benefits, opening the high wages of the country to the swarming labourers of the towns. Under a wise system of emigration, such a law would doubtless be unnecessary. When such a system is instituted, let the law be repealed; but while the present system continues, we trust it will remain as a protection to the destitute.

By the laws of New York, there is a similar contribution levied on the ship-owner, but it is not expended in forwarding.

It is merely an hospital fund. In addition to this contribution, the ship-master is required to give bond that no passenger brought by his ship shall become chargeable on the city funds within a certain time. This induces some circumspection in taking passengers. A lame beggar, with a bag of oatmeal and a sack of potatoes, would be rejected by the master of a ship which was taking passengers for New York; whereas he would find no difficulty in securing a passage to Canada. For this reason, combined with the low rate of passage to Canada, caused by the number of ships engaged in the timber trade which go to British America in ballast, the condition of the settlers who proceed by way of New York, is somewhat superior to that of the settlers by the way of the river St. Lawrence.

The most powerful circumstance influencing the distribution of emigrants, is previous habits. The agricultural peasantry seldom stay longer in the cities than they are obliged. If in a destitute condition—if possessed of little or nothing but their hands—they are to be seen anxiously seeking such employment as they are capable of undertaking; keeping ever in sight a settlement in the interior, with a steadiness of purpose which is invariably crowned with success. It is among the females of this class that begging prevails. In the cities of Quebec, Montreal, New York, and Albany, (but seldom in more inland towns, and *never* on the roads or in the country,) females surrounded with children are to be seen asking alms, and the expressed purpose is always “to get up the country.” While this is going on, the males of the family are either working, or seeking work, with the same end in view; and where three-quarters of a dollar (3s. 1½d. sterling) is deemed low wages, it will be at once perceived that the beggar of to-day is often lost sight of to-morrow. In Quebec and Montreal, in two or three weeks after the last arrival, and before the close of the upward navigation, the vestiges of this destitute class are nearly obliterated, being confined perhaps to a few widowed mothers and orphan children, and a handful of profligate and improvident people, who are to be met with in all countries.

But it is not among the agricultural population of Ireland alone that emigration takes place. The towns annually furnish a large number. These persons being skilled in all kinds of labour usually required in towns, are prone to remain either in the cities in which they land, or in the towns throughout the country. They, of course, command higher wages than the mere unskilled labourer; and as the cities become drained of hands towards the close of the season, they are generally enabled to make advantageous permanent contracts. The rapid progress of building in the Canadian and American cities, furnishes

a vast and increasing amount of employment to Irish mechanics and labourers. The shipping of Quebec and New York gives employment to another class. Of the cartmen, porters, and warehousemen also, a large proportion are Irish. But there is this feature in employment in America, which is wanting in Great Britain and Ireland, namely, its progressive character. The porter of to-day, whose only capital is a stout rope, or a strong leather strap, will, before long, become the owner of a barrow. In due time his barrow is exchanged for a horse and cart. After a while, he is enabled to purchase a second horse and cart, and becomes a master carter. His progress is now rapid; he has more leisure on his hands; he devotes a portion of his time to public matters; he aspires to municipal office, is chosen, and thus forms a part of the system of self-government which has now for upwards of half a century been in successful operation in the United States of America.

Men who start from a higher point, as regards intelligence and skill, have fewer difficulties to struggle against. Mechanical skill especially, is not merely highly rewarded, but new roads to advancement are continually opening to it. The steam-boat—the canal—the railroad—are all steps to fortune, in a country where hands are seldom supplied to the full extent required. It cannot be deemed out of place here to mention that Andrew Jackson, the late President of the United States, was the son of an Irish emigrant, and was born either just before his parents left Ireland, or just after their arrival in the then Colonies.

The reader will now be prepared to learn, that in New York, Quebec, and Montreal, the Irish are a very influential body. In New York especially, it is actually a grave subject of complaint with one political party, that “the Irish govern the city, and rule the elections.” Let it be remembered, that this complaint is made in a city where the majority only can prevail; so that it stands as evidence of numerical power, which, in such a case, is legitimate power. It is a standing joke in that city, that an Irishman, being asked how he intended to vote, and not having gotten rid of his old country associations, exclaimed, “against the government, any how.” It so happens, however, that the Irish in America for the most part vote with the government; that is, with the democratic or popular party, and against the federal or privilege-craving class. Now, in New York city, this class, though in a minority, is very numerous. At the elections, it is prone to put in practice the arts of intimidation, so common in this country; but, as the voter has the protection of the ballot, the popular party has always prevailed: It is by this wealthy class, that the complaints to which we have already alluded are usually put forward; and as the New York press is for

the most part under their controul, by means of their mercantile advertising patronage, it is not at all wonderful that our commercial connexions make us more acquainted with these complaints than with the explanation thereof. There are thirteen or fourteen daily papers in New York, of which the democratic party is only able to support two, namely, the *Evening Post* and the *Times*, so that, in nearly all cases, our views of American affairs are seen through a false medium.

Miss Martineau, in her able and courageous account of the state of society in the United States, exposes most completely the character of the wealthy privilege-desiring class, and, among other things, explains that most of the outrageous Lynch law mobs are composed of *gentlemen*. From personal knowledge, we can bear testimony to the truth of the statement, in a sufficient number of cases to warrant its being received as the general rule. During the election of 1832, for instance, the class in question strained every nerve, but without success, to defeat every candidate for office who was in favour of the Jackson or democratic party; it was an important point with them to create a fear of the operation of democracy—to make the people, in short, afraid of the people. Among the means resorted to, was that of closing all places of business,—warehouses, stores, shops, &c. The effect was, that the whole population was turned, in an excited state, into the streets. In the course of the election, all sorts of petty jealousies were fomented between the Irish and native American population, and some fights took place. Hereupon loud were the complaints of the “turbulence of the people,” “the undue influence of the Irish,” and so forth. But the majesty of the law prevailed. The authorities were enabled generally to keep order, and the grand object of the “Bank, or Whig party,”* as they are called, was defeated.

Every now and then, some of the choice spirits of the “great Atlantic city,” amuse themselves, when tired of wantonly assaulting the coloured people, (their more constant pastime) by attacking the Irish. As Irishmen never were in the habit of quietly presenting a second cheek when the first had been smote, the result invariably is—blows in return. Occasionally it may be, Pat does venture beyond the mere line of defence, and handsomely punishes his aggressors. Now, however strange it may appear, your genuine gentlemen mobs never can take (they cannot even give) a sound beating quietly. The day after said beating, their papers are filled with the disinterested and sympathetic bewailings of the advertisement-bribed editors, whose

* The Democratic Party is stigmatized as the “Tory” party, because it is possessed of the government; the privilege-hunting party is called Whig.

eloquence is perchance farther excited, by a broken scone falling to the share of one of their honourable and dignified corps. Think of such respectables being soundly drubbed by a parcel of vulgar mechanics and labourers ! Verily, "the Irish must be put down ;" they must be "taxed ;" "doors must be shut upon them ;" they must be "declared contraband,"—or fair New York will speedily become an Irish city.

The following account of one of these attacks upon the Irish is from a recent number of the *New York Times*, a well-conducted democratic paper :—

"On Tuesday night a riot occurred at the corner of Mott and Walker streets. From affidavits made at the police office, it appears that a number of persons resolved to amuse themselves by an attack on "the b—dy Irish." They accordingly commenced operations by attacking a house in the above neighbourhood. The inmates armed themselves with pokers, tongs, &c., and quickly repulsed the assailants. A party of watchmen, hearing of the affray, proceeded to the spot. The Irish, supposing the assailants were returning in greater numbers, by mistake rushed upon the watchmen, by whom a number were taken prisoners. The magistrates have expressed their decided opinion, that the Irish were not the assailants, and that the attack was wanton and unprovoked. Notwithstanding, the *Commercial** insists on knowing best, and serves up the Irish as if they were so many strawberries, a mouthful each."

The *Evening Star*, too, a paper of the anti-democratic and *pro tanto* anti-Irish paper, admits that the Irish were aggrieved, and even speaks of these attacks as a common practice.

"Some of our rowdies (says the *Star*) last night, in their shameful practice of attacking the Irish, made an assault on two Americans in mistake, one of whom, a gentleman from Poughkeepsie, they shamefully beat ; the other escaped in a house near by in the Bowery."

We shall pass over the cowardly attacks which have been made by the fanatical convent-burners of Boston on the Irish of that city, because they were "religious" attacks, and moreover, throw no light on the subject-matter of this article. Suffice it to say, that the warm attachment of the Irish to popular rights—to political and religious freedom—has caused them to identify themselves with the system of government which prevails in their adopted country, and this alone is enough to unite them in brotherly amity with the mass of the people, in common cause against the remnants of the federal party.

In Canada, in like manner, we find them acting with the majority, and the House of Assembly, against the local oligarchy,

* The *Commercial* is a paper of the anti-democratic or Whig (Anglicè, *Tory*) party.

and especially against the coercive resolutions of the British Government. The infamous Orange societies of Ireland have, we are sorry to say, also found their way across the Atlantic, and have taken root in the upper province, under the auspices of a Mr. Ogle Gowan, a person of disreputable character, who is stated, in the evidence on Orange Lodges, collected by a Committee of the House of Commons, to have been discountenanced by the parent society, on account of his tarnished reputation. However, such societies must die away before the influence of adverse opinion, and even now they are seldom heard of, except during a contested election, where the local government finds them useful.

Before we leave the Irish of the towns, and follow those of the country, we must give another piece of evidence exhibiting the Irish character, under its new developement, in a favourable light. The document to which we allude, is a jail return, comprising the prisons of three States, namely, New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. It is as follows:—

Received in	-	-	1828	1829	1830	1831	1832
New York—							
Sing-Sing	-		143	163	356	352	264
Irish	-		13	3	15	22	22
Auburn	-	-	174	170	114	174	192
Irish	-		15	10	3	12	13
Connecticut—							
Wethersfield	-		42	83	63	58	57
Irish	-		3	1	1	2	1
New Jersey	-	-	41	36	61	65	46
Irish	-		1	1	4	7	1
Total No. received	-		400	445	594	649	559
Irish	-		32	15	23	43	37
Total received during the five years	-		-	-	-	-	2,657
Irish	-		-	-	-	-	150

or, 5.64 per cent.

We regret that we have not a classified statement of the offences for which these one hundred and fifty persons suffered punishment. The following piece of testimony on the subject, however, from a New York paper of neutral politics, called the *Journal of Commerce*, says much in favour of the Irish in America:—

"You will scarcely ever find an Irishman dabbling in counterfeit money, or breaking into houses, or stealing, or swindling: but if there is any fighting to be done, he is very apt to have a hand in it. Our reporter, who attends the Police and Sessions' Courts—himself an Irishman—has frequently noticed this fact."

And even this fighting is the result of some sudden excitement. A Montreal paper observes on this same point:—"Although Pat may occasionally 'meet with a friend and for love knock him down,' there is, it must be allowed, but little 'malice prepense' in his whole composition."

Distress is too frequently the parent of crime. In old and thickly-peopled countries, where the number of the competitors for employment have a perpetual tendency to exceed the means of employing them, it is not surprising that the frightful misery which ensues should drive men to the commission of acts of delinquency, which, under other circumstances, they would avoid. The father of a starving family, who steals a loaf of bread to allay the cravings of his half-famished children, can scarcely be deemed a criminal; and although society, for its own protection, may visit such acts with punishment, that punishment is of the exemplary, not of the *vindictive* kind. It is intended to be motive-creating; and although the legislator cannot, the philanthropist *must*, draw a marked line between the offences which spring from necessity and those which spring from vicious habit. A single crime does not make an habitual criminal. A man who forms a single project, is not a projector in the ordinary sense of the word,* neither does any man think of stigmatizing as a drunkard him who is once "overtaken" over a social board. We need not multiply illustrations. We have always felt convinced of the truth of the proposition which Mr. Bulwer's novel of *Paul Clifford* seems to have been designed to illustrate,—namely, that "Man is the creature of circumstances;" but had we entertained a doubt on the subject, the absence of crime among the Irish in America would have generated the opinion.

When it is considered that a long course of misery might be presumed, without direct evidence of the fact, to operate unfavourably on the character of the people of the "old country" generally, and that the mass of the hired labourers of the State of New York are Irish, the force of the new circumstances in the midst of which they are placed, as shown in the small amount of crime, and improved habits generally, is truly surprising. "It is a pleasing record," says the *New York Courier and Enquirer*, "in favour of the sons of the Emerald Isle."

* Whateley's Logic.

Let us now take leave of the Irish of the towns, and follow the agricultural settler to his home in the wilds, where he is busily engaged hewing fortune out of the primeval forest.

The agricultural labourer, who reaches America with nothing but his hands, we have already described as lingering only just so long, in the city at which he has landed, as will enable him to proceed up the country. Here his first step towards comfort and a home is employment on public works. The rapid progress of canal, road, and railroad, in America, is in every mouth. Hence there is always something of the kind, to *absorb*, as the phrase is, the current immigration of the season. Now, on these public works, wages are seldom below ten dollars, and we have seen labourers called to a particular spot, by advertisement, offering sixteen dollars a month, besides food. Now, food being ample, and the Irish settler having generally a fair stock of clothing with him, these sixteen dollars become an accumulating surplus, which, in a twelvemonth, converts the labourer into an independent landowner. Land in the United States is sold at one dollar and a quarter per acre, cash; so that an industrious man, for one hundred dollars, or for a little more than twenty pounds, can obtain a quarter section, or eighty acres of the richest land. It will be readily conceived, that the labourer is not long in becoming an independent landowner; indeed, for his own ultimate comfort, the transition takes place too early; the labourer is induced to take land before he possesses the means of working it; whereas, were he to make up his mind to labour for a while for hire, his present gains would be materially improved; and when he was in a condition to go upon the land, his fortune and prospects would develop themselves more rapidly. The best way to ensure a miserably poor population, is, undoubtedly, to grant land on application. The labourer will then refuse to work for hire, and the capitalist, being unable to procure labour, is literally scared out of the country. Charge a price, however, for land, and the labourer must work for hire for a while. What are the consequences? There is at once a supply of labour; the capitalist is again attracted to the country; and inasmuch as by the concurrence of labour and capital, the gross return from the land is greatly increased, it follows, that the share received by the labourer in the shape of wages, is absolutely greater than the whole produce which he could possibly draw from the soil by his own unassisted labour. Now, let us look at the other compartment of the picture. In the event of a minimum price being fixed for land, how superior is the condition of a labourer when he becomes a purchaser. He has paid a sum of money for his land. Let us suppose it is his last shilling. Inasmuch

as land cannot be had elsewhere for less, his credit is good in the nearest town for nearly, if not quite, the value of his land. He can go to the merchant for his plough, his provisions, and his seed-corn, on the credit of "his crops that are to be." In short, he has at once become a substantial yeoman. We cannot, in this place, give full developement to this and other principles of colonization, for which the world is indebted to the able and acute author of "*England and America*." At present, we must content ourselves by saying, that, in favour of those principles, we bring the testimony of a long experience in new countries, and that at some future, and probably not a very distant, period, we shall take up the subject at length.

Man is assuredly the creature of circumstances, and in no case is this proposition so abundantly evidenced as in that of the Irish in America. Possessed of land under the favourable condition of purchase, not of grant, the Irish peasant becomes a new being. He labours not for a landlord but for himself;—he, therefore, labours cheerfully and vigorously. No "hanging gale" lies like an incubus upon his mind, overweighing its elasticity, damping its energies, and converting frugality and parsimony into what may well be called virtual improvidence. His savings are his own; he, therefore, saves. In short, to use the words of Mr. Laing, the intelligent and truly philanthropic author of "*A Residence in Norway*"—a book by the way which every body should read—"the restraints of property are upon him."

Among the settlers of the country, as among those of the towns, it would be wrong to judge generally by the condition of those few who take into the new country capital and knowledge, with all the superior habits which capital and knowledge are prone to generate. Some of the best farmers in the Canadas and the Northern States are Irishmen of the more fortunate (we eschew the word better) class; and it is worthy of notice, that it is to the pen of an Irish farmer that the American agriculturist is indebted for an admirable treatise on agriculture adapted to the North American climate.*

Looking, then, only to the poorest—the least fortunate of the Irish settlers, the philanthropist will have cause for genuine satisfaction. The second season finds him in the midst of comparative comfort and ease, the first stage towards independence and wealth. We have, at this moment, in our "mind's eye," several flourishing settlements, composed almost exclusively of Irish, once the poorest, on spots which a few years since were

* Evans's *Canadian Agriculture*, Montreal, 1836.

unbroken forest. By some of these, populous towns are supplied with the produce of the dairy, with poultry, pork, vegetables, &c., whilst the larger farmers, generally the older settlers, grow for a more distant market.

Captain Basil Hall, in his account of some Irish settlements in Upper Canada, gapes and wonders on what appears to us to be not merely a natural but a most creditable feeling on the part of the poor settlers.

"It was curious to observe," says Captain Hall, "that most of these settlers, however destitute they may notoriously have been in Ireland, always contrived to evade any acknowledgment of the fact when direct questions were put to them, and seemed rather to wish I should believe they had been very well off at home."

Among those settlers, Captain Hall meets with an old man, who, with his family, had gone upon the land the previous year. Him, through the introduction of the government agent, the gallant Captain is enabled to put to the question, and the following was the result:—

"For a long time he eluded all my interrogatories with great address. He could not say whether he were better off now than he had been at home, though he admitted that here he was master of a large free property, and in Ireland he had only a farm; the rent of which, by his own confession, he had never been able to pay.

" 'Would you like, then, I asked, to be put down in Ireland again, Mr. Cornelius, just as you were?'

" 'I would, Sir.'

" 'Then why don't you go.—Who hinders you?'

" 'Because, Sir—because of the boys.'

" 'What of the boys?' I asked.

" 'Oh! it's because my two sons like this country very well; they have chopped twenty acres of land, and we have got crops of wheat and oats, and Indian corn and potatoes, and some turnips, all coming up and almost ready to cut, besides five or six more acres all ready chopped and logged, and soon to be in cultivation; and the boys like their independence. In short, Sir, it is a fine country for the poor man if he be industrious, and were it not for the ague a good country and a rich one; though, to be sure, it's rather out of the way, and the roads are bad, and the winter very cold, yet there is always plenty to eat, and sure employment, and good pay, for them that like to work. * * * For all that,' he continues, 'I might have done very well in Ireland.'

" 'Why the plague, then,' I asked, 'did you remove to America?'

" 'Oh, Sir,' cried he, laughing, and harping upon the old string, 'it was all entirely owing to the boys. They were not content I should be left without them, and I was not content they should go without me * * * In short, Sir, we resolved to go together, and here we are very happy and contented, and here we will remain.'—*Hall's Travels in America*, c. x.

The poor Irishman's former condition was a painful theme; it was doubtless fraught with the most revolting associations. That Captain Hall should have probed the poor man's healing wounds, proves only his extreme ignorance of the more delicate portions of our mental organization. Instead of wondering with Captain Hall that his questions were evaded, our marvel is, that the insolence of the questioner was not resented on the spot. The wondrous forbearance of the poor Irishman can only be accounted for by the fact, that he had been too long accustomed to insult and aristocratic insolence in his own land, to be much surprised at it in his new country. The extract is chiefly valuable to us as a farther piece of evidence of the prosperity which attends the Irish in America.

The first and most honourable use which the Irish settler makes of his prosperity, is to provide for the education of his children. A pretty exclusive acquaintance with the Irish in America,* enables the writer of this article to pronounce this to be the "salient point" of the Irish character. In Ireland, misery may cause it to lie dormant; but in America, where the depressing influence of poverty and wretchedness is speedily removed, the latent spark is rapidly kindled into a bright and enduring flame. This anxiety is, to a certain extent, shared by settlers from all nations, but it appears most conspicuous among the Irish, probably from the extreme unfavourableness of their previous condition to any thing like moral cultivation. Thus the second generation of the Irish in America, affords a favourable and accurate sample of what Ireland might, and would be, under an improved social system. The picture is hope-exciting in the extreme.

Another feature in the character of the Irish in America is, that they never forget the less fortunate friends whom they left behind. It is impossible to take up an American shipping newspaper, without seeing numerous advertisements addressed "to persons desirous of having out their friends from Ireland," and intimating "that passages may be secured by applying and paying the passage-money to so and so." From Cork, Waterford, and Belfast, a large number of passages are thus engaged every year. No one can have any, the slightest acquaintance with the course and incidents of emigration, without being acquainted with numerous cases where persons recently destitute

* It may, perhaps, be proper to state that the writer of this article was never in Ireland, his only knowledge of the state of that country is derived from a somewhat careful examination of the Evidence collected by the Commissioners of the Irish Poor Inquiry, and especially from the very able work of Mr. Revans, which has already been carefully reviewed in the third number of this publication.

have, after a very short time, become the means of relieving, in this way, the destitution of others. The charity of the rich may count for something. Sorry, indeed, should we be to doubt its existence, but at whatever we may state it, the charity of the poor towards the poor would count it ten times over. Ireland feels this in every way, but in no way more so than in that which we have just pointed out.

There is one fact in the Irish about America which will doubtless astound those who are prone to philosophise gratuitously about unhappy Ireland. It is that whiskey is extremely cheap, and drunkenness as rare as sunshine in November. In some parts of North America, whiskey can be brought as low as ten pence per gallon, and in few places is good malt whiskey higher than a couple of shillings. Now Irishmen, in Ireland, are known to make free with whiskey whenever they can get it, and the sapient inference is, that if they could always get it, they would always be making free with it. Without any specific facts, it would be easy to show that the reasoning is unsound; but, in the present case, such a mode of showing is unnecessary. We have the fact that the Irish in America are not a drunken race; the next thing is to account for it.

A miserable, hopeless, despairing man, is likely to have habits differing widely from those of a thriving and industrious man. One of the habits usually found with hopeless men is that of intoxication. Some, it is true, may resist it, but generally speaking, a wretched outcast will indulge in ardent spirits whenever he has an opportunity. It is owing to the rarity of the opportunity, that the habit with Irishmen is much less firmly rooted than some persons may be disposed to allow; hence, when the miserable man is converted into the thriving man—when he acquires some stake in existence, he does not always drink, though he may have always the opportunity. Mr. Laing, in his *Residence in Norway* already quoted, remarks a similar coincidence of sobriety with cheap spirits in that country; and his opinion, grounded thereon, is, that free distillation and the total absence of duty on spirits, would be beneficial to Ireland. “The effect would be,” says Mr. Laing, “that every body in Ireland would be drunk for a fortnight, after which there would be order and sobriety.” Looking at America, we quite agree with Mr. Laing in his opinion that free distillation would be beneficial, but at the same time, we cannot conceal from ourselves, that while misery—the offspring of a vicious social system—remains, in-sobriety will remain also. As by means of a series of reforms, the condition of the Irish peasantry is improved, the class of drinkers will be narrowed, till at last it will be confined to the

outcast population, whilst among the mass, drunkenness will be as rare as in America. Where intoxication, however, is indulged, as in America, it soon destroys. A drunkard's case is there hopeless; there is no check to indulgence; a speedy death is inevitable. Extreme cases, however, are always rare, and they are generally to be traced to general misfortune and improvidence.

We have done. In a brief space we have endeavoured to throw together a few facts, to show that to the industrious Irishmen, and in short to the industrious of all other countries, there is hope in the New World.

ART. IX.—1. *A Christian Peace Offering; being an Endeavour to abate the Asperities of the Controversy between the Roman and English Catholic Churches.* By the Hon. Arthur Philip Perceval, B. C. L., Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majesty, Rector of East Horseley, and late Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford. 1829.

2. *The Roman Schism Illustrated, from the Records of the Catholic Church.* By the Hon. and Rev. A. P. Perceval, B. C. L. 1836.

THE former of these works was published about the time of the passing of the Emancipation Bill. Its object is explained by its title. Reviewing *seriatim* those tenets and practices of the Catholic Church, at which the members of the Establishment take umbrage, it shows, that with regard to many of them, the strangest misconception prevails; and contends, with respect to the remainder, that if several are erroneous, and some few absolutely indefensible, they are not prejudicial to the salvation of those who conscientiously adhere to them:* that our Church is a true and apostolic branch of the Catholic Church, the elder sister of the English one; preserving many things which the younger would do well to recover, and would have willingly retained;† and exhibiting the power of grace, in the piety, generous self-devotion, zeal for the spread of the Gospel in every clime, and other eminent virtues of her children.‡ So that, the author conceives, “with one or two exceptions, the differences between the Churches, are such as may safely and fairly be left to each individual, without impugning the purity or truth

* P. 9.

† Pp. 74, 86, 88.

‡ P. 139, and *sq.*

of our religion.* And although he feels most devotedly attached to the Anglican Church, it is "more in her essential, positive, and eternal character of Catholic, than in her accidental, conditional, and temporary one of Protestant."† In fact, he regards it as indisputable, that if the Church of Rome had been, three centuries ago, what it is now, the Reformation would never have taken place.‡ In most points of importance, Catholics "have shown a disposition to meet the scruples and wishes of reasonable objectors;" and have modified, if not entirely laid aside, most of the things considered censurable.§ Members of the Church of England are called on, therefore, to extend to their erring brethren, who are joint-believers in essentials, the right-hand of fellowship. Let them, at least, refrain from lavishing opprobrious designations upon them; let them consider that the errors of many dissenting sects, and especially of the Socinians,|| are incomparably greater. Let them unite heart and hand with those from whom they have been too long severed; from whom, however, *they* never separated,¶ in protecting the holy and common cause of Christianity.**

The benevolent spirit *generally* exhibited in the work, of which we have just given an outline, is worthy of all praise, and by us, most cheerfully acknowledged. The author sometimes touches a jarring string, and produces a grating discord; still the dominant tone is kind and conciliatory, and soothing to ears habitually dinned with fierce and contumelious invective. Partialities and mistakes were to be expected in a work of this description, yet the tenor of the work might claim for most of them, a liberal indulgence. Not, however, for them *all*; and therefore, though as critics, we should pass with a light hand over inaccuracy of quotation,†† supposing that the author erred by implicit reliance on the polemics of by-gone times, as Catholics, we cannot but protest against several serious misstatements.‡‡

* P. 120.

† P. 118.

‡ P. 155.

§ P. 121.

|| Pp. 122, 161.

¶ P. 158.

** P. 164.

†† We could allege very many instances. Take the following as a specimen: "Melchior Canus, lib. i. de Euchar. c. 34, p. 171. Then follow some garbled words out of a sentence from the *Loci Theologici* of that author: *Book the third, chapter the third.* Canus wrote no treatise on the Eucharist. Cyril of Jerusalem is confounded with Cyril of Alexandria. (p. 25 and 26 comp. p. 173.) St. Chrysostom's assertion on the uselessness of *preaching* in an unknown tongue (x. 323) is adduced as an argument against our *praying* in a language that is not vernacular.—p. 171.

‡‡ Take this example, p. 32. "The only sort of an argument which they (Catholics) *pretend* to advance in favour of their custom is... the fear lest any of the consecrated wine should be spilled, &c." We pretend to advance a great many more, as Mr. P. may see, if he will consult Bosquet's treatise on the subject, or even the *Catechismus Romanus*. Part ii. ch. 4; § 7p, &c. We have primitive custom, the

It must have been these which caused the book to be "ill regarded" by the members of our communion,* if indeed our author be not mistaken in his averment of the fact. Certain it is, that from those of his own, "it procured him many a cold look, and colder suspicion, not unaccompanied, in some instances, with open vituperation, as though he were a Papist in disguise."† This is just what we should have expected. The gross ignorance of Protestants generally, and of very many of their clergy too, regarding our principles and conduct; the hatred, which not a few of the sanctimonious bear to our name, if not to our persons; interest, fashion, political partizanship, then raging at fever heat; these severally, and unitedly, would, in common course, entail upon the man, who asked for us a dispassionate hearing, a rebuke similar to that which Nicodemus met with, (John viii. 52). Mr. Perceval does not regret what he then did; although he conceives, that "in his anxiety to see justice done to us, he did us more than justice."‡ Our position being now altered, he deems himself more at liberty to take another course; as our attitude seems threatening, he has laid aside the olive-branch of the pacificator, and mounted a battery to assail us as schismatics.

All misgivings and reproach must now be hushed, and "the disguised Papist" received into favour. If eight years ago he did us "*more than justice*," he has now done us *much less* than justice; and this novel mode of equalization, this unequitable adjustment, will, we doubt not, earn him store of compliments from the orthodox. His book is characterized by almost unmitigated hostility. We are no longer brethren, but schismatics and heretics. The style is altogether polemical. One would doubt whether the two works had the same parentage; they have the resemblance which Demea has to Micio. Upon a closer examination, we find they have some characteristics in common, which are reputable to neither. We have now to treat with Demea; he will try our patience somewhat, but we shall endeavour to keep our temper. Micio would be better company, but we have no choice; all we can do, is occasionally to prevail on him to interpose between his testy brother and ourselves. We

admissions of Protestants, and many other arguments. Again (p. 37), he asserts that, '*nothing* can be advanced in defence of the practice of using a dead language in our liturgy.' Let him read Lingard's Tracts, p. 27, 100. Moreover, we who teach the Catholic doctrine on images, "are obliged in our common catechisms to *omit* one of the commandments of the decalogue, lest our people should see," &c. (p. 40.) We have taught that doctrine many years, and have read Exodus and Deuteronomy often and often; and handed the bible to children to read therein; apprising them of that *stale calumny* which Mr. Perceval has reproduced. But enough on this.

* Roman Schism, p. 10.

† Ibid.

‡ Ibid.

are here reminded of a very sensible question once proposed by Mr. Perceval: "When did harsh language and ill-names ever convince a man of his error? or abuse and reproach win over an opponent?"* If he had proposed that same question to himself in the course of his performance now before us, its character would have been very different. We wish to remember and abide by the maxim; however, he must not complain if, in repelling his offensive imputations; we appear to treat him ungently. "One language to a friend, another to an insulting foe." Mr. Perceval is in the latter guise at present, and we shall return him the proper answer; not vague invective, or coarse personality; or malignant insinuation, but plain exposure of his fallacies; strict discussion of the use he has made of his authorities; vindication from wanton and unjust aggression. We begin with a general outline of the work.

Its contents may be briefly described. It is a collection of decrees and canons of councils, (principally general) and other public formularies, with short historical notices, and copious remarks. The Greek and Latin originals are accompanied with the author's English version.

The work opens with an introductory discourse, in which, 1st. Exceptions are briefly taken against the œcumenicity of all councils, from the Deutero-Nicene, anno 787, to that of Trent, both inclusive. 2ndly. Suggestions (the reasonableness of which, with some modifications, we admit) are offered to both parties in this religious controversy, as to the adhering exclusively to authorized statements, and public recognized formularies. 3rdly. The position of the Church of England as to our distinctive doctrines, is stated to be as follows:—She bears witness against them in her articles, but does not (so at least our author labours to prove, "against some later writers on the English side,") hold the doctrines in question to be fundamental errors. "Neither at baptism nor confirmation does she require an opinion on these points; nor when converts come over to her from Rome, has she authorized her ministers to make a disavowal of belief, in respect to them, a term of communion."† 4thly. Now, unless the Church of Rome can show her peculiar tenets to be necessary to saving-faith, she is guilty of the sin of schism, in imposing terms of communion arbitrarily and unwarrantably. And, 5thly. The *proof* of this necessity is incumbent on her, and (supposing it to be producible at all) must be ready at hand; if not in holy writ, at least, in the records of tradition. If her advocates fail in producing it, then "they are witnesses

* P. Offering, p. 120.

† P. 22.

against themselves, that they are teaching for necessary Christian truths, doctrines which they can produce no authority for so teaching, from either of those sources from which alone they themselves affirm Christian truth is to be derived."* 6thly. That "the term schismatical, is applicable in a particular sense," to us British and Irish Catholics, our author argues, from the interpretation which he affixes to certain canons of the ancient Church; from the fact, that the British (Protestant) Bishops do not require unwarrantable terms of communion; and from the position that the succession of our hierarchy, whether in Great Britain or *Ireland*, is broken. Our Bishops are therefore of foreign stock; intruders, whose acts are invalid, and whom the canons order to be punished.†

Several of these positions cannot be discussed, till the testimonies adduced in the body of the work have been examined. The last of them, must be to many of our readers so very startling, that, to afford them time to recover from the shock, we will turn back to the commencement of the introduction, which we have just faithfully epitomized. The author is anxious to convince "every person, that the decrees set forth, (in his book) are not dead letters, . . . but form, in part, the obligation of the priesthood, and the term of communion in the Roman Church."‡ Admitting the authority of the councils in question, "the Bishops of the Roman communion, and the Churches under them, (the *laity* we suppose) must needs receive the decrees of these councils, however novel, monstrous, and self-contradictory, with the same feeling of implicit reverence, with which the rest of the Catholic Church (*i. e.* Protestants) are taught to receive the deep things contained in the books of the Sacred Scriptures."§ We may as well remark, in passing, the fallacy which lurks under this representation. Here is a collection of dogmatical definitions and disciplinary rules. Of the latter, many have reference only to peculiar circumstances and times. That they are inapplicable at the present day is obvious, for they could not be carried into effect.|| As *teachers*, the assessors of councils propounded doctrines. As *legislators*, they framed enactments. Is Mr. Perceval prepared to deny legislative competence to the pastors of the Christian Church? We suppose not. Can he find any

* P. 25.

† P. 31, 33.

‡ P. 12.

§ Ibid.

|| Let us suppose Mr. Perceval, or his diocesan, to have a dispute with his Grace of Canterbury. The ninth canon of Chalcedon will tell us how it is to be settled. "Let him have access either to the exarch of the diocese (*who is he?*), or to the throne of the Imperial Constantinople, and let it be *there* judged." (p. 42.) Yet "the style and authority of a general synod has been allowed by the whole Church to this council." (p. 13.)

example of a wise legislature, inflexibly insisting on its laws once passed, without derogation, or repeal, or modification? The law given by the Most High himself, was qualified, in order to meet exigencies, and adapt it to circumstances.* Injunctions given by our Blessed Lord, were subsequently superseded by others from the same venerable authority.† The distinction between doctrinal decisions, and disciplinary constitutions, being so obvious and palpable, how could Mr. Perceval overlook it? And where is his candour in leading his readers to suppose of the whole, what can be said only of a part?

For the purpose of “*convincing*” his readers of that which has no foundation in fact, he annexes to his introduction sundry documents. There are several *petites bévues* even here, which we advise him to rectify. He quotes as an extract, from the *Bulla Cænæ*, that which is no part of it. He affirms that the *Bulla Cænæ* is published at Rome every Maunday Thursday. The “publication” has been suspended since the time of Clement XIV. He exhibits at full length “the oath required by a Bishop at his consecration, according to the usage of the Church of Rome,”‡ though he ought to have known and informed his readers, that the oath has long since been curtailed and modified by Rome herself, to prevent misconception; and that, in this *altered* state, it is taken by the Bishops of these Islands.§ Allowing, with Dr. Doyle,|| that there is nothing “very amiable” in this oath, we believe it need not fear a comparison with those taken in Bow Church. On “the authorized form of reconciling a convert,” we shall say no more, than that the rehearsing of Pope Pius’s *Profession* is a local *custom*, not a universal practice; unexceptionable, in our humble judgment, and laudable; enacted however, by no general church-law. Mr. Perceval may turn to the Roman Ritual and Pontifical. We retain the title

* Compare Leviticus xvii. 1. *seq.* with Deut. xii, 15, 20. and see Michaelis’ Commentaries on the Laws of Moses, *passim*.

† Matthew x. 5. compared with xxviii. 19. We should be glad to know why that purely scriptural Church, the Anglican, does not see to the observance of *all* things enjoined, Acts xv. 29. They are indiscriminately declared to be “*necessary things*.” verse 28.

‡ P. 38.

§ Dr. Doyle’s Evidence, 1825. Murray’s Ed. p. 386, 553. “There was one expression in it (the oath) which seemed to give offence...? The word *persequar* was understood by persons differing from us, as if it imposed an obligation upon us, by the oath, to persecute in the ordinary meaning of the word. [Mr. Perceval is one of these; for (p. xl.) he translates ‘*persecute and attack*.’] The meaning which we attributed to it was only to follow up by argument, and convince if we could by proof. However, as it was an ambiguous expression, it was strck out of the oath.” There are other clauses omitted.

|| Dr. Doyle ubi supra, p. 386.

of *Profession*,* whilst Mr. Perceval (p. 33-37) substitutes the designation of *Creed*. The distinction is not very material in our eyes, but of vast importance to him; as it furnishes him with the opportunity of setting the Pope in arms against the Council of Ephesus. Whether his precipitate ardour to gain this idle and imaginary triumph, may not compromise his own Church, which retains a *creed* composed, in all probability, subsequent to that council, (A.D. 431) we leave himself to determine.†

We now address ourselves to the body of the work. Part the First, professes to exhibit "the testimony of the general councils of the first seven centuries." That the modern Church of England admits, at least, the first four general councils is proved by *an Act of Parliament*, the best voucher certainly, for a churchman of the present day; that "the ecclesiastical legislature" at earlier periods, received those four and two succeeding ones, is evinced by quoting canons of domestic councils. The inference is, that the Anglicans admit the first six councils, styled general by the Catholic world. Our author is not disposed "to enter into the question, as to the proper degree of deference to be paid to a general council,"‡ but flatters himself that he has proved, that "these solemn assemblies furnish one uniform, consistent, and continuous body of evidence against the Church of Rome;"§ that "whatever this Church has that is Catholic, she has in common with the Church of England; and that in whatever points she differs from the Church of England, she has herself departed from the primitive, orthodox, Catholic, and apostolic standard."||

The "ecclesiastical legislature" of England, admitted other councils as general, besides the first six;¶ hence Mr. Perceval's limitation is altogether arbitrary. However, let this pass. The conciliar decrees of the first seven centuries, bear decisive evidence against us. This is what he has undertaken to prove. And how? By confounding ecclesiastical regulations with

* *Symboli naturam etsi non nomen habet Professio Fidei quam Ritus IV & decretis Trid. præscripsit.*—Dens ii. § 24.

† The Creed of St. Athanasius; which the Church of England tells us "ought thoroughly to be received and believed." (Art. viii.) That the venerable bishop of Alexandria was not its author, is, however, universally allowed. To whom, then, or to what period, is it to be ascribed? To Hilary of Arles, according to Waterland. (*Crit. Hist.* ch. 8.) But, according to Tomline, whose statement we believe to be nearly accurate here, "it was never heard of till the sixth century . . . it had never the sanction of any council, and it is doubtful whether it was ever admitted into the Eastern Church,"—Elem. ii. 219.

‡ P. 13.

§ P. 68.

|| P. 70.

¶ We will take the Council of Constance as an instance. We suppose it will not be denied that the English Church recognised this synod to be œcumenical. In the proceedings against Tylour it is recognised as such. Wilkins iii. 411.

doctrinal decrees; by setting provincial synods on the same footing with those recognized as œcumenical; by a tissue of mis-statements on matters of historical fact; by gratuitous and illogical inference.

Let us begin by testing his accuracy as an historian. He has guardedly "disclaimed a familiar acquaintance with many of the authors whose works he has cited;" the work "having been undertaken, and pursued apart from books, except the few that his own collection furnished."* This is said as an excuse for incompleteness or inaccuracy. Now, we are not inclined to attribute motives; and therefore, we shall abstain from charging the writer with intentional perversion of truth. If, however, Mr. Perceval's evidence shall be shown at utter variance with historical documents when confronted with them; if the contradiction be such as materially to affect the questions at issue, his act of accusation falls to the ground.

Now, what he has deeply at heart, in this first portion of his work, is to overturn the supremacy of the See of Rome. It may be thought of some importance to ascertain who presided at the first general council. Our author shall answer in his own words:—

"The Bishop of Rome, by reason of infirmity, was absent, but sent two presbyters to subscribe in his stead. The Roman writers do not hesitate to assert that these presbyters, together with Hosius, Bishop of Cordova, presided in the council; *an assertion destitute of all foundation, not one of the Greek historians making the SLIGHTEST mention of it.*"—p. 18.

We know not whom it may please Mr. Perceval to admit into his class of Greek historians; but we should think that Gelasius of Cyzicum, may fairly be allowed to enter. He wrote a History of the Council; he wrote in Greek, and Mr. Perceval has elsewhere quoted him as his *sole* and *sufficient* authority for the discourse of St. Paphruti[†]. Now, Gelasius[‡] has preserved a fragment of Eusebius, which is in direct opposition to our

* P. 35.

† We purposely abstain from discussing the truth of the common story regarding St. Paphnutius. We are satisfied that it is a fiction; but we will allow Mr. P. all the benefit he can derive from its being admitted as authentic. We will only ask, why he did not refer to Socrates and Sozomen, the former of whom represents the bishop to have disallowed marriages contracted by clergymen, both of whom declare the inhibition to be an *ancient* ecclesiastical tradition.—pp. 40 and 437. Ed. *Vales.* 1668.

‡ It may be seen in Labbe ii. 153. He quotes from Eusebius's third book of the *Life of Constantine*. There can be no reasonable doubt on the authenticity of the passage; though Gelasius has in one particular misunderstood it.—See *Valesius*, p. 221.

author's statement. St. Athanasius, an eye-witness of the proceedings, a participator in the acts of the council, may surely rank as a Greek historian. And he repeatedly* assures us of the fact of the venerable Osius presiding. It will not be pretended that Osius was the representative of the Emperor. The actual appearance of Constantine at the council, and his demeanour thereat, are sufficient to obviate this supposition.† The bishop's previous mission to Alexandria by the Emperor, is altogether irrelevant to the question. Nor was the presidency a personal distinction, awarded by the fathers in consideration of the legate's personal merits. Great as these undoubtedly were, there were others,‡ whose learning, eloquence, influence, holiness, miraculous powers, would have obtained them the precedence, had not the Bishop of Cordova been the representative of Rome. His two associates, moreover, though but presbyters, rank in Socrates' enumeration,§ before any of the Eastern Patriarchs.

The Council of Sardica, in Illyricum, celebrated twenty-two years after, may be regarded (for a reason which we shall presently state) as an appendix to that of Nice. We are not concerned with the discussion, whether it may claim to be in every respect œcumenical. Certainly, if Mr. Perceval were its only historian, we should decide against its claim. For it was "a synod of western bishops, to the number of *eighty*." This is stated || on the authority of Beveridge. Will it be believed, that the eighty here alluded to, are the Eusebean faction, who, by previous concert, and on most frivolous pretences, receded from the council; formed a counter-meeting at Philippopolis, and subsequently circulated their decrees, under the borrowed name of Sardican? We must again refer to ancient and contemporary testimony. Sozomen and Socrates give *three hundred* as the number of fathers assembled at the legitimate council. St. Athanasius, who was present, warrants the computation.†† Mr. Perceval, however, reduces them to *eighty*!

* Ed. Par. 1627. I. 703. πάντων μάλιστα καὶ μάλλον ἐπιφανὲς ὁ γέρον ποίᾳ γὰρ οὐ καθήγησατο συνόδου; καὶ λέγων ὁρθῶς, οὐ πάντας ἔπεισε; ποία τις ἐκκλησία τῆς τοῦτον προστασίας οὐκ ἔχει σημεῖα τὰ καλλίστα; P. 837. οὗτος καὶ συνοδὸν κατηγγέιται καὶ γράφων ἀκούεται πανταχοῦ· οὗτος καὶ τὴν ἐν Νικαίᾳ πίστιν ἐξέθετο καὶ τοὺς Ἀρειανοὺς ἐκέρυξεν αἰρετικούς εἶναι πανταχοῦ.

† And see Athan. I. 840-845.

‡ Eusebius, Eustathius, Pottamon, James of Nisibis, &c.

§ Lib. i. cap. 13, p. 43. Ed. Vales.

|| P. 9.

†† "From the West about 300, as Athanasius says, from the East merely 76, as Sabinus says," Socrates, (101.) Sozomen (514) gives the same numbers without mentioning his vouchers. The long list of provinces given by St. Athanasius, i. 827,

The synodal letter of the Council to Pope Julius, who here also presided by his legates, is extant.* We will quote a short passage to show in what manner "the See of Peter" was regarded at this time. "*Hoc enim optimum et congruentissimum esse videbitur si ad CAPUT, id est ad Petri Apostoli sedem de singulis quibusque provinciis Domini referant sacerdotes.*" And yet we are to believe that little more than twenty years before this, "prior to the Council of Nice, the Bishop of Rome's jurisdiction extended no further than the lower part of Italy, and the islands of Sicily, Corsica, and Sardinia."† We do not assert, that the words above quoted demonstrate a plenary jurisdiction, as belonging to the Roman See; we are content to inquire, why such deference should be judged proper and fitting by this assemblage of prelates, gathered from every quarter, if within the recollection of every one of them, the Pope had only that narrow jurisdiction which our author has described?

To whatever cause we may assign the fact, the decrees of this council, (and indeed of subsequent ones also) passed by the name of *Nicene*. This is proved by existing manuscripts,‡ and by various documents of the fourth and fifth centuries.§ Amongst these canons of Sardica, there are several which confirm the power of the apostolic See of Rome, to entertain appeals from deposed bishops. The Roman bishop might renew an investigation, with the result of which a prelate was dissatisfied. Pending his decision, the see of the appealing bishop was not to be filled up. Were a bishop, deposed by those of his province, to enter an appeal to Rome, the Pope is requested, if he think fit to renew the inquiry, to issue a commission to the bishops of the nearest province, to hear and determine. And should the Roman bishop be requested again to rehear the cause, and to send a legate, who, bearing the authority of him sending, should determine, in conjunction with the bishops, it was declared competent in him, to act *as he judged fit*. "*Erit in potestate Episcopi quid velit et quid æstimet.*"||

proves that this number is not overstated. The *precise* number must remain undetermined. From comparing the *details* given in the 2d Apology (767, *seq.*) with the amount stated (p. 818), it is evident that in the latter place there is an error in the numeral.

* It may be seen in St. Hilary's Works. 436 *seq.* Ed. Par. 1652.

† P. 48.

‡ See *Orsi*. Istoria Eccl. xii. 120. Tillemont, vi. 753.

§ Innoc. I, Ep. 23 ad Conc. Tolet.—Labbe II, 1282. Leo Mag. ad Theod.—Ep. 25, p. 115. Ed. Lugd. 1672.—Siricius, Ep. 3. Labbe II, 1028.—If the reader will attentively consult these passages, he will see that the "*canons or rules*" therein cited as '*Nicene*,' belong to the Sardican or some other post-Nicene council.

|| See the canons, p. 20.

In the year 419, seventy years after this council, Pope Zosimus, commissioned his legates to a plenary council in Africa, about to be holden at Carthage. Their instructions, embraced, amongst other matters, the enforcement of the Nicene (Sardican) Canons, relative to Bishops' Appeals. Upon the requisition being read at the council, the members, whilst they avowed their determination to abide by the Nicene decrees, expressed a *doubt*, whether the decrees recited, were of the number.* It was suggested to write to the bishops of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, to obtain authentic copies, and set the matter at rest; and to request Boniface, (who had lately succeeded Zosimus in the Roman See) to make a similar perquisition. The whole discussion, turned on the simple matter of *fact*, as is manifest from the language of the Fathers assembled. "Whatever had been established in the Nicene Council, they would all observe. Pending the examination of the archives of that council, they would observe what was stated as having emanated from it." Now, let the reader compare this narrative drawn from the acts of the council, (which are cited below) † with the account furnished by Mr. Perceval:—

"When the Bishop of Rome, Boniface, tried to *usurp* over the African Churches, by hearing appeals from them, he pleaded these canons (of Sardica) as his authority, asserting them to be Nicene. The African bishops having made inquiries concerning them, returned for answer, that no such canons were passed at Nice, and *peremptorily rejected his claim of hearing appeals, alleging that they knew of no canon of the Fathers, authorizing such a course.*"—p. 19.

This is certainly writing history in an *original* style.‡ And the

* Labbe II, 1590, *seq.*—Alypius of Tagaste: "adhuc tamen me movet quoniam cum inspiceremus Græca exemplaria hujus synodi Nicænæ, ista ibi, nescio quâ ratione, minimè invenimus"....Faustinus the Legate: "nec vestra sanctitas præjudicat ecclesiæ Romanæ.....quia dicere dignatus est.....*dubios* esse canones."

† Labbe, *ubi supra*. "Ut omnis postmodum *ambiguitas* auferatur."—After the reading of the seventeenth canon of the (Sardican) council.—St. Augustin of Hippo said: "Et hoc nos servaturos profitemur, salvâ diligentiore inquisitione concilii Nicænæ." Shortly after the whole council said, Omnia quæ in Nicæno concilio statuta sunt nobis omnibus, placent." And in the letter to *Boniface*: "Quod donec fiat (*viz.* the enquiry) hæc quæ in commonitorio supradicto nobis allegata sunt....nos usque ad probationem servaturos esse profitemur," &c.—Labbe II, 1672.

‡ Mr. Perceval may attempt to mend the matter, by alleging the espistle written about seven years later to Celestine I, (Labbe, 1674.) But he will not succeed. The latter argues strongly against the inexpediency of admitting appeals, and too readily sending legates at the request of appellants; and indeed the proved guilt of Apiarius, and the unbecoming behaviour of Faustinus the legate, furnished a good reason for this remonstrance.—Yet the *right* of entertaining *episcopal* appeals is not *denied*: though arguments, which will hardly satisfy any reader, are alleged against the practice of admitting any appeals from Africa. The language adopted is a clear evidence that the right was allowed. "Impendio *deprecamur*, ut deinceps ad vestras

author goes on to contend, that "as the African Churches had no less than thirty-six representatives at the Council of Sardica, the fair inference from all this is, that these canons are *spurious*." He forgets the intervening lapse of time; nor has he attended to the circumstance, that the assembled bishops' memory was so far from being quick and ready, with regard to the decrees enacted at Nice, that they only *doubted* whether the alleged and misnamed canons, were the offspring of that council or not. There are traces of the Sardican decrees in the African councils prior to this time.* As to Mr. Perceval's attempt to limit the appellate jurisdiction to Pope Julius, it is a mere verbal cavil—mere special pleading. The Pope's name occurs in the 3rd canon, the name of his office *only* is enounced in the 5th, (or 7th). He might have shown a little reasonable scepticism, by discussing the 12th canon of the Council of Antioch; or said something in defence of its disputed authenticity, before adducing † it as peremptory authority to overrule the canons of Sardica. He might and *he ought* to have quoted the whole of the decree of the synod of Milevi, A.D. 416. To understand the nature of an enactment, we are surely to inquire what persons it regards. Now, this decree imposes a penalty on priests, deacons, and inferior clerks, appealing to parts beyond the sea. The original says nothing on *bishops*.‡ But the question, at the sixth Council of Carthage, turned on appeals made by the latter. What purpose, but that of deception, can be answered by adducing irrelevant and mutilated documents?

We unwillingly detain our readers so long in this early stage of our inquiry; but it cannot be unimportant to mark the

aures hinc venientes non facilius admittatis. Executores etiam clericos vestros quibusque petentibus, nolite mittere, nolite concedere," &c. That it was fully exercised is manifest from St. Augustin. Ep. 43 and 209. (Ed. Ben. p. 72, and 592, seq.) See Orsi's masterly digression on this subject, xii. 105, seq.

* In the council held at Carthage by Gratus. (Labbe II. 715.) Gratus recites a Sardican canon, the enactment of which he remembered. It stands as the fifteenth in the Greek acts of the Sardican council. Labbe II, 640.

† St. Chrysostom protested before a council (Socr. vi. ch. 18), that the canon was the work of the *Arians*. And the historian ascribes its origin to the hatred borne against Athanasius, by those who had leagued to abolish the belief of the consubstantiality of the Son. If this be true, Mr. Perceval is welcome to make what use he pleases of it.

‡ See the canon in Labbe II, 1542. We are aware that in Justell the canon has, together with some other immaterial variations, the clause "*Sicut de Episcopis sæpe constitutum est.*" (Justell, Biblioth. I, 344.)—Our surprise is, that Mr. P. has not availed himself of this. But then, he would have had to show how it came to pass that during the dispute with Faustinus, these "repeated decisions" respecting bishops should never have been cited. Either, therefore, the clause is an interpolation, or its meaning is, that appeals to bishops from the inferior clergy had been the subject of frequent enactments—an assertion which does not affect the question on appeals of bishops to the See of Rome.

position of the Roman Church in the middle of the fourth century; its recognized prerogatives, and its services to the cause of Christian truth. Exiled prelates from every quarter found there a refuge and a home. In Julius, they met with a cordial protector; a steady vindicator of their common faith; an assertor of outraged truth and humanity. The "prerogatives of his Church," and "the dignity of his chair,"* enabled him to discharge these Christian duties towards his injured brethren, with the more effect. Who can read the letter addressed to the Orientals, without recognizing the apostolic spirit which it breathes? Or what man will bring himself to believe that the claims therein stated with such mild dignity, such calm protestation, are the arrogant pretensions of an aspirant to exorbitant power?† "Had the bishop been suspected of any thing of this nature, the Church here ought to have been written to. But, now, without having given us satisfactory information, and having on their side done as they would, they afterwards wish us, who have not condemned, to join in the sentence. Not such are the ordinances of Paul: not so did the Fathers deliver. This is a strange form, a new device. . . . What we have received from the blessed Apostle Peter, I lay before you," &c. Indeed, the history of Arianism deposes to the important truth that a visible head is necessary to the existence of the Church. Riot, disorder, insubordination, were congenial to the heretical faction; adhesion to one common head was the opposite principle of those whose faith was sound. The assertors of the Divinity of the *invisible* head of the Church felt the necessity of close union, and combined action with the *visible*. Those who impugned the majesty of the former, would, by natural consequence, deride the latter.‡ The tendencies of the two parties were opposite; the systems for their respective furtherance were, therefore, altogether unlike. If we descend a century lower, we shall find these antagonist principles in operation during the discussions on the Incarnation. Contempt of authority, and insolence to

* The very expressions of Socrates, 91. ὁ δὲ (Ιουλιος) ἀτε προνόμια τῆς ἐν Ρώμῃ ἐκκλησίας ἔχουσης. . . . ὠχύρωσεν αὐτοὺς κ. τ. λ. And Sozomen (p. 507) having related that Julius, after examining the charges made by (or against) each of the refugee bishops, and finding them all to agree on the Nicene dogma, admitted them to communion, subjoins that he restored them, and why he restored them. διὰ δε τῶν παντῶν κηδεμονίας αὐτῶν προσηκούσης διὰ τὴν ΑΞΙΑΝ ΤΟΥ ΘΡΟΝΟΥ ἐκάστῳ τὴν ἰδίαν ἐκκλησίαν ἀπέδωκε

† It may be seen in St. Athanas. 1st Apology, 789-754.

. . . . ἃ γὰρ παρειλήφαμεν παρὰ τοῦ μακαρίου Πέτρου τοῦ Ἀποστόλου, ταῦτα καὶ ὑμῖν δηλώ καὶ οὐκ ἂν ἐγράψα, φανερὰ ἡγούμενος εἶναι τοῦτα παρὰ πάντων, εἰ μὴ τὰ γενόμενα ἡμᾶς ἐτάραξεν—753.

‡ Athan. i. 832-835, &c.

the representatives of the holy sec, were linked with the heretical impieties of Dioscurus, and the other abettors of Eutyches at the *latrocinale* of Ephesus. At Chalcedon, the exposition of the Catholic faith, as given by the Roman pontiff,* was adopted by the council as its own dogmatical decree. Peter was declared "to have spoken by Leo; his successor and faithful interpreter had presided at their consult, as the head over the members, or a father over his children."†

"In this age," says Casaubon,‡ "the most abandoned heretics daily wrought on the Church the havoc which boars make in a vineyard. There were none to withstand their progress or to do the good cause a service but the Roman bishop. No one unacquainted with ecclesiastical history is ignorant that for many ages God employed the instrumentality of the Roman pontiffs to preserve the integrity of doctrine and belief."

Rome may, then, we suppose, be allowed to style herself "the mother and mistress of churches." Oh no! for was not the Church of Jerusalem *incidentally* declared by the bishops at Constantinople, the mother of all churches? Now, this discovery§ of Mr. Perceval is, perhaps, more unfavourable to his cause than he is aware. His Church is as much affected by that *obiter dictum* as is ours. If the *title* be equipollent in both documents—"the *professio fidei*" and the Synodical letter—the modern Church of England owes obedience to that of Jerusalem, and is schismatical in not paying it. Secondly; how will he account for the precedency enjoyed by the other three oriental patriarchates, and the comparatively recent establishment of that of Jerusalem *with the concurrence of the Roman see*,|| except by admitting that the whole branch of this ecclesiastical economy is of human, arbitrary, and variable regulation: an admission which seals the fate of his cherished hypothesis. But, thirdly; Mr. Perceval must allow us Catholics to know and to believe as well as himself, that it was at Jerusalem the Christian Church was first formed; that it was thence the word of God went forth to all the world.¶ In this sense Jerusalem *was* the mother of all churches. Rome, with which Irenæus, in his day,

* The letter to Flavian. Labbe iv. 343-357.

† Synodal letter, apud Labbe IV, 833, *seq.* In the Vatican library there is a MS. of this letter, subscribed not only by the three named in the MS. quoted by Labbe (840); but by sixty other bishops, with an intimation that all the rest subscribed it. On this MS. see Orsi xiv. 335.

‡ Exercit. in Baron. Ex. xv.

§ That he attaches no small importance to it may be supposed from his honouring this fragment of two lines, and its accompanying version, with a clear page. (p. 32.)

|| See Nat. Alexander, in Sac. v. Dis. 16.

¶ Luke xxiv. 47.

declared every Church must agree,* is the mother and mistress of all churches—as a directive and controlling power, (so we believe,) over all churches within the Catholic pale, has been intrusted to her. It is in this sense that the *profession*, adopting the words of the Councils of Lateran and of Trent,† applies to her that title. Can this be said of the Church of Jerusalem?

Our author is unmercifully severe‡ on “the Roman writers” and the Church of Rome, for refusing to receive certain canons of ecclesiastical *discipline* enacted at the first council of Constantinople, whilst reverencing and adhering to *doctrinal* decisions pronounced there. This confusion of two things essentially distinct, is one of his customary fallacies. In the present case, his invective is especially absurd. “The claim of a council to the character and authority of an oecumenical one, is to be determined,” he elsewhere tells us, “*solely* by the *ex post facto* testimony borne to it by the Church throughout the world in the *reception* of its decrees.”§ This is his theory. Well, the universal Church embraced the doctrinal decisions of Constantinople, but did not receive its disciplinary canons. What is there to justify the author’s charging us with “playing fast and loose with *inspiration*?” (an expression, by the way, equally elegant and accurate,) or his reproaching us with “contradiction and absurdity?” But he has an important object in view. The third canon of the above-mentioned council provided “that the Bishop of Constantinople should have rank *next after* the Bishop of Rome.” This our author deems conclusive proof “against the claim of the Bishop of Rome as successor to St. Peter!”|| The logic here escapes our apprehension; but let us proceed. The Roman Church demurred to accepting the decree; and when a similar enactment passed at¶ the Council of Chalcedon, the Pontiff St. Leo, despite of the importunity of its delegates, the solicitations of the Emperor and Pulcheria, or the plausible arguments with which it was recommended to his *confirmation*,† *refused to sanction it*. This

* “Ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potiore[m] principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, hoc est qui sunt undique fideles.” Cont. Hær. III. 3 Mass. 175. The original of the passage is lost; but there is little doubt that *convenire* is the rendering of *συμβαίνειν*. Now, we are warranted in explaining this word by “to agree.”

† iv. Lat. Can. v.º—Trid. Sess. xxv. *De delectu ciborum*, &c. Innocent I. equivalently applied the title to his see, long before. See his two rescripts to the Africans. —Labbe II. 1283—1289.

‡ Page 23.

§ Page 22.

|| Page 31.

¶ See Orsi KIV, 323-330.

† *Rogamus igitur et tuis decretis nostrum honora iudicium et sicut nos capiti in bonis adiecimus consonantiam sic et summitas tua filiis quod decet adimpleat.* (*αὐτοπληρωσὶ τοῦ πριπτον*) Labbe, 837. This language is as deferential as that of the

fact may serve to show the authority of a pope in the fifth age. And, fortunately, the letters are extant which explain at length the grounds of his refusal. The intelligent pope never supposed that a request to sanction a decree conferring an honour subordinate to his own, was a summons to abdicate his own office, or deny his apostolic succession. No. His sole ground of rejection was, that the canon was derogatory to the patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria, whose precedence had been fixed by the Nicene Council.* Not a word escapes him on the injury done to his primacy, though Mr. Pèrceval has satisfied himself that the canon had abolished his claims to it.

Our remarks on the early councils have run out to such length, that we have no space to comment on Mr. Perceval's statements respecting Honorius and Vigilius. We shall leave him to extricate himself from the perplexities in which the Chalcedonian canons, 9th and 18th, have entangled him.† These thorny questions are uninviting to our readers, who will be more amused, if not instructed, by the following exquisite piece of *naïveté*:—

“When Rome ceased to be the seat of the government of the world, even the honour allowed by the early Church fell as of *right* to the ground. Still, if the bishop of that see will content himself with *asking*, out of respect to antiquity, that the same precedence should be *allowed* to him, as was of old, there *can be little doubt*, that that request would be readily granted by the bishops of the rest of Christendom.”—p. 50.

These are words of comfort certainly. They were seriously penned no doubt: yet we own they appear to us excessively ludicrous. Should a leveller in some provincial print civilly invite a sovereign of this empire to renounce his rule and titles, and assure him he had little doubt that his liberal compeers would grant his request, in consideration of family ancestry, to rank as first commoner, the call and accompanying *assurance* would not be half so amazing or so droll, as this augury which

Council of Trent on a similar occasion. Compare also the request made by the second Council of Carthage to Innocent I. (Labbe II, 1534.) “*Ut statutis nostræ mediocritatis etiam apostolicæ sedis adhibeatur auctoritas.*”

* See the letters to Anatolius, Marcian, and Pulcheria. (Labbe, 843-850) The first may be described as a severe rebuke from a superior: the second clearly states the ground of the refusal: the third moreover annuls the canon most authoritatively. “*Consensiones vero episcoporum, sanctorum canonum apud Nicæam conditorum regulis repugnantes. . . in irritum mittimus, &c. per auctoritatem beati Petri apostoli generali prorsus definitione cassamus. . . ita ut si multo plures aliud quam illi [the Nicene fathers] statuere, decernerent, in nullâ reverentiâ sit habendum quidquid fuerit a prædictorum constitutione diversum.*”

† Page 56-61.

the minister of a country village gives of the future condensation of bishops (*his* amongst the rest), towards one, who, in the name of his Divine Master, "rules from sea to sea, and from the river to the uttermost bounds of the earth."*

A council held by a few bishops at Laodicea, about the middle of the fourth century, prohibited the reciting in Church offices of any private psalms or uncanonical books, and followed up the prohibition by an enumeration of the canonical books *to be read* (*ὅσα δὲ ἀναγιγνώσκονται*) from the Old and New Testaments. In this list, most of those books of the Old Testament which *we* receive, but which Protestants generally style apocryphal, are omitted. This Mr. Perceval considers conclusive against our Canon of Scripture. Unfortunately, his argument proves too much. For the list of the books of the New Testament, which (for reasons best known to himself) he passes over in silence, does not contain the book of St. John's Apocalypse, which Mr. Perceval is bound to receive no less than the gospel of the same inspired author. He will, perhaps, say that to *omit* is not the same thing as to *reject*. Very true: then it cannot be shown that the Council *rejected* the portions of the Old Testament omitted in its enumeration, *till* it be conceded that it rejected the book of Revelations. We leave it to his option.†

From the terms of a decree of the same council, limiting the Eucharistic offering‡ to Saturday and Sunday during Lent-time, he has drawn an inference against transubstantiation. "It is not right, (*expedient*?) says the council, *to offer bread* (*ἄρον προσφέρειν*) in Lent, except only on the Sabbath (Saturday) and Lord's Day." Now for the comment. "I would simply ask, whether, if the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation and the mass had now obtained, any impartial person can suppose that *the sacrifice of the holy Eucharist* would have been spoken of as it is here?"—p. 56.

Mr. Perceval's mode of speech here will suggest a ready reply to his question. We ask *him*, whether, after performing the communion service in his Church, he would describe the solemn act he had been engaged in as "eating bread and drinking wine with his parishioners." We are sure his religious

* Psalm lxxi.

† We have reasoned on the supposition that these Canons are genuine. This however is a disputed point. They are absent from several MSS. (See *Auctoritas utriusq. lib. Machab. asserta adversus G. Wernsdorf*. Vienna, 1749.) The Church of England reads the "Apocrypha," in her public service, but does not read the inspired Song of Songs; and her bishops *tolerate* at least the singing of hymns which are equally fanatical and ridiculous. (See specimens in *British Critic*, No. xl.)

‡ The canon may refer not to the Eucharist, but to the *Eulogia* offered by the people (see Binius i. 1527); but we decline pressing this consideration.

feelings would revolt from such a description of "the holy sacrifice of the Eucharist." Modes of expression and customs vary with times and countries. *He* would not allow the communicant to stand or sit; yet the early Church permitted both these postures; the one as symbolical of our Lord's resurrection, the other as conformable to what took place at the institution. He would not administer at the same table at which he had just partaken of a customary meal, or make no distinction of vessels: yet the primitive Church had no such scruple. As with usages so it is with words and phrases. We read in the Acts xx. 7, that the disciples came together "*to break bread*;" we see nothing in the expression at variance with our doctrine on the Eucharist; yet we should not (unless in circumstances when the allusion to that or similar texts was manifest) think "breaking bread" a fitting mode of speaking at the present day, on the most sacred action of a Christian life.* Does the expression of St. Luke, however, contravene our tenet? The testimony of ages answers—No. Still less, then, can that of the Laodicean fathers be an argument against it.

Thus far we have reviewed the principal of Mr. Perceval's accusations against us, drawn from the seven first centuries. Time forbids our noticing many other charges; for every page of his commentary teems with imputation, and a volume much larger than his own must be written, if a specific reply to all his criminations be required. Our readers, we believe, will be satisfied that this portion of the work exhibits no small store of historical inaccuracies and unwarrantable assumptions. Now, what must the superstructure be, when the foundations are so rotten? When our prosecutor is self-contradictory, and his allegations are belied by his own witnesses, what must be the fate of his bill of indictment? A singular change has come over our author since the year 1829. The Church-political war-whoop, seems not only to have stunned his ears, but disturbed his judgment. The insane root of faction has taken his understanding prisoner. There was a certain obliquity in his views before; but it was occasional only, now it is habitual. He has become cross-grained, partial, undiscerning, and splenetic. We are sorry to observe it; but we must remind him, that a work executed in this frame of mind, is not calculated to "promote the cause of that peace and union for which our Master prayed, and of that charity which he appointed to be the distinguishing virtue of his followers."—*Preface*, xxxvi.

* "The holy bread of eternal life"—"the bread of heaven"—"daily bread"—"substantial bread"—and the like scriptural forms, are nevertheless frequent in our liturgical and devotional books.

The second part is in exact keeping with the first; or rather, is more profuse than the former in criminations^a and scoffs, and exhibits greater perversions of fact and testimony. We have neither time nor inclination to notice the whole of them; nor on the questions which we shall touch, is it our purpose to enter into a formal vindication of Catholic doctrine and practice. Others have performed and will perform this task; our engagement is to show that Mr. Perceval is a false accuser. Let us begin with the question on the use and veneration of images. As his work is not a mere reprint of certain public instruments and formularies, but professes to exhibit historical facts in illustration of them, and to put the reader in possession of the state of the case as it comes before him for judgment, why did he omit—first, all notice of the practice of the early Church; secondly, all notice of the character, views, and methods of the impugnors of prevalent belief and custom; thirdly, all notice of those particulars which would ascertain what regard is due to the Council of Constantinople, where Iconoclasm triumphed? That these are considerable omissions will soon be made evident, and the reader will infer that they were designed, and that Mr. Perceval had recourse to *suppression* for the purpose of deception.

1. The use of images and pictures, although far less general in the ancient than in the present Church, was by no means rare. The discovery of figures of saints in the tomb of Priscilla, the mother of Pudens, which took place in 1578, and is recorded by Baronius,* as well as later investigations appealed to by Orsi,† are ample vouchers for this assertion. Tertullian‡ and St. Jerome§ allude to the custom of representing the Good Shepherd, or the apostles, on cups and chalices. A picture of St. Paul had left so lively an impression on the mind of St. Ambrose, that he judged an apparition to be like him.|| The picture was probably ancient, and supposed authentic. The sarcastic author of the *Philopatris* has given a description of the apostle's person, which agrees with excavated records.¶ And Eusebius** had seen pictures of Christ and the Apostles Peter and Paul, which he avers to be of a date contemporary with the blessed persons they represented. He was also†† an eye-witness of a statue of Christ, erected long before at Pancas, which represented him as receiving the supplication of the woman cured of the issue of

* Ad. an. 57, n. 112.

† Istoria Eccl. i. 265.

‡ De Pudic. cap. 10, p. 363. Ed. Rig.

§ In Jonæ Prophetæ, cap. iv.

|| Ep. 53. In the Roman Ed. The Benedictines, however, question its genuineness. Yet St. Austin's statement, vii. 502, is an argument in its favour.

¶ Orsi, 266.

** Hist. K. vii. 18, p. 265.

†† Ib.

blood. (Mark v.) The fear of being confounded with the heathens, to whom they bore no proportion in numbers—abomination of that idolatry from which they had lately emerged, and into which the weak and ignorant might relapse; in some instances, perhaps, the reasonable apprehension that these religious memorials would be outraged by the persecutors;* these are satisfactory reasons why, on the whole, comparatively few emblems of this nature, in some places absolutely none, were admitted. It was with holy pictures and images as with holy places. “Man was considered the best image of his God; a small building was ill-suited to the Divinity, when the whole universe was too small a temple for his immensity.” Such is the view taken by Octavius in the celebrated dialogue of Minutius Felix,† and those who allege the practice of the primitive Church against holy images, would do well to consider whether it be not equally conclusive against setting apart places for religious worship. When Christianity had gained peaceable settlement, churches arose, richly adorned and furnished with statues and paintings. These erections and embellishments were, however, not the work of a day, nor were they simultaneous in every country.* In fact, religion does not consist in them, though they are its evidences and useful auxiliaries. The Catholic faith needs for its existence neither a blessed nor consecrated place of worship, nor a crucifix, nor a picture. The Catholic Church could dispense with one and all of them.‡ Her disciplinary regulations determine the *use* of these and such like things, which may and do vary according to circumstances, local and temporary. As to doctrine, it is otherwise. We hold it lawful to make and to honour the images and pictures of Christ and his saints; we hold it to be profane to treat them with disrespect or wantonly to destroy them, when their use is permitted by the Church: we hold it to be false that the honour referred to the prototype, when we kneel before the representation thereof, is in any sense idolatrous, and anathematize an assertion of this nature as a wicked error.

There are some (and Mr. Perceval may be of the number)

* This we take to be the purpose of the thirty-sixth canon of the council of Eliberis, which has been the theme of so much discussion. “Placuit picturas in Ecclesiis esse non debere; ne quod colitur, et adoratur, in parietibus depingatur.” (Labbe I, 974.) No mention is made of images: pictures on walls could not be protected from the insults of infidels. If the reader be not satisfied with this construction, which we have borrowed from the learned cardinal Gotti (Verit. Rel. Chr. II, 326), and which appears to us the most obvious; let him read the note of the judicious Aubespine on the canon in question. (Ib. 998.) Certain it is that this synod of nineteen bishops affords no conclusive testimony against the practice of the Catholic Church.

† P. 104. Ed. Oxon. 1631.

‡ See Petavius De Incarn. xv. 13.

who contend that the use and allowableness of *pictures* and of *images* rest on distinct grounds; who are tolerant to the pencil, but inexorable to the chisel. We should be glad to know the reason of this distinction. In the divine law, (which, on *their* interpretation, is peremptory against us,) no distinction of the sort is made; the *ἰδωλῶμα* is prohibited equally with the *γλυπτόν*. *Parium eadem est ratio*. Does the divine law prohibit the designing of a human figure on ivory, wood, canvass, or the like? The answer is,—no; except that design be for idolatrous purposes. Then, except for idolatrous purposes, the carving of wood, stone, ivory, or the like, is not prohibited by the divine law.

2. Who were the impugnors of the belief and practice of the Church in the eighth century? what were their views and methods? Tertullian, we believe, drew an argument in favour of Christianity from the character of its first systematic persecutor, the monster Nero. It is an advantage to the cause of sacred images, in like manner, that their destroyers have almost exclusively been profane reprobates. At a period antecedent to that of which we are going to speak, the apostate Julian threw down the statue of our Lord at Páncas, to which we lately alluded. The Christians, as would be done by our Catholic brethren at the present day, gathered up the fragments and buried them.* An especial enmity to the images of Christ was borne, consistently enough, by the Manichees and the Phantastici. But it was in the eighth century that the fury of Iconoclasm had full scope. An Arabian caliph, instigated by a Jewish impostor; a savage barbarian, Leo the Isaurian, encouraged by a renegade bishop and plighted to Jews; his impious son and successor, whose profanity sorely thrills every Christian heart when he reads of it; these were successively the leaders in the unholy war. The first proceeded at once to destruction; the second disclaimed all purpose of this nature at the commencement; he would *raise* the images, to save the honourable objects from the indignity of a kiss! They were raised, to be speedily thrown contumeliously to the ground. All this was done despite of the religious feelings of the people, of the protestations of the venerable Germanus,† (who was ignominiously expelled his see, for his constancy in urging and adhering to tradition and immemorial custom,) and of the energetic remonstrances and condemnation of the Roman see, whereunto the persecutor had directed a specious and cajoling solicitation. We need say nothing of the inhuman atrocities which historians have recorded.

* Sozomen, v. 21, p. 629.

† See his life in Alban Butler, May 12.

3. It was deemed expedient to put a plausible show upon a cause which unveiled itself too glaringly by these enormities. Accordingly an assembly of bishops was packed at Constantinople, an. 754. The number of bishops was very considerable: but we might have expected that Mr. Perceval, in giving an account of their meeting, would have informed us that neither the patriarch of the west, nor those of Alexandria, Antioch, or Jerusalem, were present or invited. In common consistency, (to say nothing of fairness,) he should have told us this; for the absence of the Eastern (Greek) patriarchs at the 3rd Lateran and 2nd of Lyons, are, with him, decisive arguments against the authority of those councils. (pp. 84, 87.) We should also suppose that the then so-called patriarch of Constantinople is to be regarded as an intruder and heretic, according to his favourite Antiochene canon. (pp. 23, 39.) No hint of this sort is given. We are dryly told, (p. 77,) that

"The style of the seventh general council was *assumed* by the synod of 338 bishops, convened at Constantinople by the Emperor Constantine Copronymus, in the year 754. They met to *offer resistance* to the grievous error of image worship, with which the Church at that time *began* to be *afflicted*."

No doubt as to the *assumption*, which the Nicene* has justly remarked upon in words which Ivo has quoted, and which Mr. Perceval has turned into a censure of Ivo's against the *Nicene*! (p. 75.) It is not very correct to say that the synod met to *offer resistance*; there was already a consummated act whose evidences might be seen in the wreck and havoc of nearly thirty years' course. The cabal was banded to authorize the violence or to put the colour of right upon it. Mr. Perceval would have his readers believe, that in or about 754, "the Church began to be afflicted with the error of image worship." We have seen for many years past another affliction and a grievous one, in full work—the affliction of the pious people, of the expelled and insulted patriarch;—to omit the savage murder of the twelve teachers of the imperial college.

The synod met, and decreed answerably to the will of their worthy master: the course of devastation, confiscation, and outrage, went on with increased speed, till Heaven relieved the world of Constantine. Now this synod it has pleased Mr. Perceval to enrol in his book. With much better show of reason, at least with equal, he might have given us the *Latrocinale* of

* Labbe vii. 814. Action vi. In a running commentary on the style and title adopted by the assembly at C. P., the document says: "*Septima autem quomodo erit, utpote quæ non concordet cum sex prioribus sanctis et universalibus synodis: omne enim septimum,*" &c.

Ephesus, the Council of Tyre, or the Council at the Oak. But to the point—his object plainly, (though not avowedly) is to induce the reader to imagine that the faith of these courtier bishops was the faith of the Church, and that what was twenty-three years later declared at Nice, was pure innovation. Now let him consider, or rather let the reader consider, (Mr. Perceval is, no doubt, already aware of the fact, but has omitted to mention it,) that many of the prelates who had betrayed their duty at Constantinople, testified their repentance at the ensuing council, and submitted to its judgment; that some were restored on their full recantation, others deprived; that whereas three of the eastern patriarchs and the pope were not admitted to the assembly convened by Copronymus, all were represented at least in that of Nice. The two assemblies, in fact, stand relatively to each other in a position similar to that of a revolutionary convention and a constitutional legislative body. The latter quashes the acts of the former, and deals with the participants and promoters of them leniently or severely, according to the degree in which they are proved to have been implicated. Mr. Perceval mentions the legates of Pope Adrian only.

We appeal to our readers whether the many omissions which we have thus supplied, do not warrant our charging Mr. Perceval with unfairness? His work is professedly of that class of writings well known on the continent, called dogmatical histories. (*Dogmengeschichte*.) He must stand or fall by those rules of criticism to which an historian is amenable. He is not at liberty to pick out some isolated facts to *make* a case: he must state the case *fully* and *fairly*. Much less is he warranted in wresting from their legitimate meaning the authorities which he cites, or neglecting the scope and context of writers, when that scope and that context materially affect the question at issue. Mr. Perceval has done so, as we shall show presently.

The Deutero-Nicene council, in decreeing the setting up of religious figures, painted or carved, and the adorning of vessels, garments, &c. with such-like representations, followed up this disciplinary enactment by defining, that the salutation and respectful *worship* paid to these memorials was not indeed that veritable *adoration* in faith which (adoration) is due to God alone; that the honour given to the image passed to the prototype,—the person represented being the object of the devotion outwardly exhibited. In other words, that no absolute, proper, and permanent honour belonged to the image or picture, but merely such as is relative; so that (to use the words of the council of Trent, which every one, we suppose, will admit to agree with that of Nice on the present subject) “by the images which

we kiss, before which we bare the head and kneel, we adore Christ and venerate the saints whose likenesses those images express."*

Now this doctrine, our author pronounceth† to be "simply a revival of part of the old Carpocratian heresy!" Charitable and considerate words these; and especially consistent in one who would admit us to his Church-communion, even though we still adhered to the tenet. He has attempted to bolster up this charge by quotations from St. Irenæus and St. Epiphanius. But before he undertook to institute this insulting parallel between us and the disgusting fanatics of the second century, he might have asked himself, Whether Catholics confounded the images of Christ with those of Plato, Aristotle, and the like, and blended the worship of the former with the latter? And, whether Catholics offered *sacrifice* to images or not? Mr. Perceval has seen our churches, witnessed our liturgy, borne testimony to the piety of the assistants at it,‡ so that his own knowledge would have furnished him with a ready answer, and he "would not have condemned the innocent." His two authors depose to the perpetration of that two-fold impiety by the Carpocratians which we abhor from our inmost souls. And yet we are held to be the fautors and revivers of that impiety!

Let us now see in what manner he has applied his other patristic testimonies in treating on this subject. For brevity's sake, and that only, we shall confine ourselves to a few instances. He quotes St. Ambrose, and we will quote after him, but will supply an omission of his, which determines the meaning of that Father: "*Ecclesia inanes ideas et vanas nescit simulacrorum figuras, sed veram novit Trinitatis substantiam. Denique umbram abolevit, splendorem gloriæ manifestavit.*"§ Mr. Perceval has omitted the words printed in italics. Probably they are quite new to him. They show plainly that the "simulacra" here spoken of, are not palpable corporeal images, but phantoms and illusions, (*i. e.* metaphorically, and according to the antithesis,) false doctrines. Our author need not be told that the

* Con. Trid. Sess. xxv. In speaking of the veritable adoration in faith, the Nicene fathers have John iv. 24 in view. Compare Romans i. 9, and see Germanus' letter in the fourth action. The reader will perceive that we have preserved the distinction which the Greek text makes between *προσκύνησις* and *λατρεία*, worship and (supreme) adoration,—a distinction which Mr. P. has obliterated, rendering both terms by the same word—"worship." We take this opportunity of stating, that we have not examined the *whole* of Mr. Percival's versions in this second part; but that in almost every instance, where we have referred to his translation, we have met with some inaccuracy.

† P. 343.

‡ Peace Offering, 37, 139.

§ De fuga sæculi, i, 429. Ed. Ben.; compare his discourse against Auxentius, n. 32, ii. 872.

Latin word has more than one meaning. A reference to the context, might also have shown that the passages, from Clément and Minucius do not apply, unless in the supposition that the works of Chantrey and of Lawrence are to be doomed to the hatchet and the flames; or unless he can show that Catholics honour a cross, because it is (or was) an instrument for the punishment of malefactors. It was a stupid calumny in vogue amongst the heathens, that the Christians worshipped crosses, ~~because~~ they were crosses; worshipped promiscuously those who died upon them; regarded Christ as the Son of God, *because* he was crucified;* a calumny resembling many of the vulgar charges against us in the present day. We answer as did Octavius, "*Cruces nec colimus nec optamus.*" We reverence the instrument by which the martyrs and their divine Chief suffered the punishment of malefactors, but we wish not to meet with a malefactor's end. We proceed to Tertullian. His argument is levelled against Christians who made idols *for the heathens*, and thus became partakers of their idolatry. To the *scope* of the passage, Mr. Perceval is perfectly indifferent. The words, he thinks, "destroy the subtle distinction which the Roman champions attempt to draw between images and idols," (p. 418). The mere words would do more. They would involve, in the guilt of encouraging the breach of the commandments, the right reverend and noble subscribers to the Duke of Wellington's statue. But what man of sense will attempt to argue from the words of a writer, without considering their intent and bearing? Mr. Perceval might very well apply the words of Tertullian to a certain Government and Company, taking Juggernaut under protection, and encouraging its worship. As it is, his inference is like that of a man, who, from a discourse on the enormity of mixing poisons for the use of murderers and suicides, should infer that the writer was an enemy to every kind of drugs; and (although he never once alluded to *medicine*) "destroyed the *subtle* distinction attempted to be drawn," between noxious and wholesome potions. Let us recommend our author to attend more carefully to the context and drift of the authors whom he cites. Had he done so, he would no more have brought St. Jerome into the field than Tertullian. St. Jerome is censuring the preposterous honours paid to the statues of the emperors: an excess which was sneered at by Julian and controlled by Theodosius. What has this to do with the decisions of the Nicene and Tridentine Councils? In return for the scraps which Mr. P. has picked out of St. Gregory's letters to Serenus,

* Origen contra Celsum, l. ii. p. 90.

we offer him the following passage, and beg of him not to imitate some of his predecessors, who invert the words, and falsify the venerable Pope's meaning :—" Et nos quidem non quasi ante divinitatem ante illam prosternimus, sed Illum adoramus quem per imaginem aut natum aut passum, sed et in throno sedentem recordamur."* Such would be the language of the *present* Gregory, were he writing on the subject.

We intended to notice Mr. Perceval's statements respecting the Frankfort Council, but have been delayed too long on the Nicene, to be able to fulfil our purpose. We are about to enter on that of Trent, but before we proceed farther, we feel obliged to animadvert on a passage respecting the third Lateran (p. 128). The 16th canon declares, *inter alia*, that " those are not to be called oaths, but rather perjuries, which are contrary to the good of the Church and the appointments of the holy Fathers." Mr. Perceval exhibits a *fragment* of that canon, and heads the fragment with the following inscription, of course as a fair summary of its contents or declaration of its import. "*The fancied convenience of the Church of greater force than a Christian man's oath.*" Mr. Perceval—

" Ashamed, should mark that passage with a blot,
And hate the line where candour was forgot."

He has given his reader a fragment of the canon ; had he quoted it entire, his calumny would have been too evident. Now, it appears that, in the twelfth century, it was not unusual in some capitular bodies for the minority factiously to obstruct the execution of the resolves of the majority. So states the canon† in question, and it proceeds to decree that the decisions of the majority should hold good and take effect without sufferance of appeal, unless the minority could produce some reasonable allegation. There is surely nothing unequitable in this enactment : what sort of a legislature would that be which should be fettered by a small party's caprices ! But " the small party" in the case before us would allege, that their oath bound them to impede and frustrate the resolutions of the majority. Is there any man of common honesty who will maintain *such* an oath to be a lawful oath ?‡ Has it the " judgment, justice, and truth," which the Church of England,§ as well as the Catholic Church, require as

* Ad Secundin. Ep. i. 12, 54.

† Labbe x. f517.

‡ If it was the *authorized* oath taken (at their admission into the chapter) to observe the customs, it was a manifest perversion to allege that oath as a warrant for an unjust act : but a closer examination of the text of the decree will show that it was an oath to maintain abuses. " Si quis hujusmodi constitutiones quæ nec ratione juvantur nec sacris congruunt institutis jurare præsumperit," &c. This is the text in the Decretals. (ili. Ti. xi. cap. 1.) Labbe has placed it in the margin.

§ Art. 39.

the *comites jurisjurandi*? It was an engagement, which no custom could ratify, to do an unjust act. As such, it is condemned by the Council, and stigmatised as perjury. Let the Rector of Horseley talk as he pleases about "*ex post facto* benefit or convenience to the Church" (p. 346). He would denounce as perjurers any set of men who should combine on oath to obstruct him in the collecting of his tithes and dues. Of that we have little doubt. Neither would he refuse "the *ex post facto* convenience" to his purse upon such a combination being broken up. And he would tell the man who pleaded his oath, that it was "*not* a Christian man's oath;" and the custom of taking such an oath he would repute to be rather an aggravation of guilt than a palliative.

One word, in passing, on the 9th canon of the fourth Council of Lateran. We can readily understand why the Rector is so anxious to make it appear that no canons were passed at that assembly,* but we cannot discern his consistency in rating us (p. 351) for "playing fast and loose with the decrees" of this Council. The decrees and canons *here* are one and the same. If the Council passed no canons, what becomes of our *game*, or Mr. Perceval's *censure*? As to the canon in question, he has only repeated the strange blunder made in his former work.† It was enacted by the Council (and the canon was subsequently incorporated in the decretals‡) that whereas, in many parts, there existed within the same diocese, a diversity of rites and languages among the faithful, the bishop should provide for the administration of the sacraments and celebration of the service according to the diversity of rites and language. If there were urgent necessity, he might appoint a bishop of that rite and language, to perform a *vicarial* office. Any reader, moderately acquainted with the circumstances of the times, (a new empire of Constantinople had just been formed by the Latins) will at once see that this injunction regarded the languages of Greece

* P. 15 et alibi. How will he account for the almost universal persuasion to the contrary? The paradoxes of some few writers on this subject are overborne by the records of subsequent councils, the language of the Decretals, and other ancient documents. The Greek translation given by Labbe is in all probability coeval with the council. The passage which Mr. Perceval has quoted from *Platina* in one place (p. 104), and attributed to *Nauclerus* in another (p. 348), is not to the question. The war between the Genoese and Pisans was certainly some hindrance to the project of the crusade; and of this the historian is speaking; but what hindrance was it to a decree on the Trinity or Holy Sacrament, and other points whether of doctrine or discipline?

† Peace Offering, p. 35 and 136. He has quoted St. Gregory's well-known letter to St. Augustine (on the adoption of various *rites*) for no other purpose than to insinuate that the liturgy was celebrated in the vernacular tongue! Does he believe that mass was ever said in Anglo-Saxon?

‡ De Off. jud. ordin. Tit. 31, cap. 14.

and Rome, and those languages exclusively. The latter part of the canon, which is in fact the main part, and which Mr. P. omits, affords a clear warrant for this construction. It was in the East only that such a difference of *rite* and language existed, as to call for a regulation of this kind. From the canon we gather that there was a wish to establish co-ordinate bishops in dioceses where this marked diversity was found: the number of foreign settlers dissentient from the hitherto established rite must, therefore, have been very considerable. The idea of co-ordinate bishops, however, met with no favour; and if one vicar was allowed, it was only in case of "urgent necessity." No one who considers these facts, or the uniform practice of the Western Church for the three following centuries, will imagine that the Council intended to substitute the half-formed jargons of Europe for the Latin language in the Church liturgy. Mr. Perceval, a Bachelor of Laws, ought to have remembered the rule of his science.—"*Intelligentia dictorum ex causis est assumenda dicendi; quia non sermoni res, sed rei est sermo subjectus.*"*

We may apply to the portion of Mr. Perceval's book, which we are now going to comment upon, what Hardinge said of Jewel's reply: "The number of untruths and false parts rise up so infinite, that, (we will not say we are like to be overcome, but) perhaps, with abundance of matter, being loth to let foul points pass, we may be encumbered. Certain it is, rather do we find distress what to leave than what to touch, what to dissemble than what to refell, what to wink at than what to convince." Under such circumstances, we leave unnoticed all and every one of his misrepresentations on the subject of the Eucharist. The Canon of Scripture and the Invocation of Saints would require a longer discussion than we can afford to enter into: besides, the author has exonerated us from the task of discussing the latter question, by having justified our practice in his *Peace Offering* (p. 50-56), and on the former he acknowledges that the African Church received with one exception, (?) the canon which we adopt (p. xxi.). We address ourselves, then, to our author's notes on the Sacraments in general, and that of Penance and Extreme Unction in particular. Much, even on these topics, must remain untouched, however open to remark and easy of confutation;—a sufficient evidence nevertheless will be produced of Mr. Perceval's ignorance or insincerity.

Because St. Gregory* says, "*Sunt autem sacramenta, baptisma, Chrisma, corpus et sanguis Christi*, quæ p[ro] id sacramenta dicuntur quia sub tegumento corporalium rerum virtus Divina secretius salutem eorumdem sacramentorum operatur," and again, "*Hoc de corpore et sanguine Domini nostri J. C. hoc etiam de baptismo et chrismo sentiendum est*," Mr. Perceval concludes that he recognized no others. That is, he declared baptism, chrism, and the body and blood of Christ, to be sacraments; *therefore* he did not believe penance (for example) to be a sacrament. By parity of reasoning; because our divine Redeemer (Matt. xix.) enumerated five commandments, he did not recognize the whole Decalogue, or require the enquiring young man to fulfil any but those cited! The reader will suppose, however, that St. Gregory, in the passages cited, is a witness to at least *three* sacraments. Mr. Perceval will undeceive him: "Here are only *two* sacraments recognized, washing and anointing being *as much* included under *one*, as the body and blood are under *the other*; confirmation or chrism being *no more* a sacrament distinct from baptism than the *cup* is a sacrament distinct from the bread."!—p. 369.

The elements of the Lord's supper are bread and wine; but it was reserved for the East Horseley chair of theology to define that *water and oil* are the elements of baptism. At least the doctrine sounds new to our ears. We shall be glad to hear the judgment which that guardian of orthodoxy, the University of Oxford, may be pleased to pronounce on this dictum of "her grateful and respectful son." Meanwhile, whatever may be Mr. Perceval's practice, his Church baptizes her catechumens not in water and oil, but in water only. Yet, "chrism being no more a sacrament distinct from baptism than the cup is a sacrament distinct from the bread," it might have been expected that

* The passage is quoted from the Decretum of Gratian, part ii. cause i. q. 1, ch. 84.—How much of that chapter is from St. Gregory is uncertain: nor is it material to enquire. Gratian's thesis is as follows: "Non merita sacerdotum sed virtus divina sacramenta sanctificat." The signification of the words 'mysterium' and 'sacramentum' is laid down, and the applicability of both terms, more particularly of the latter, to baptism, chrism, and the body and blood of Christ, is stated. From the unity of the Spirit operating throughout the Church, it is inferred that the effect of the sacrament is independent of the merits of their minister, so that whether he be good or bad the benefit is the same to the receiver. The Eucharist, and Baptism, and Chrism, are enumerated as sacraments; and it is inferred, that as of the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ ("than which nothing is better") we are to hold and believe as above stated, so likewise on baptism and chrism, because a Divine power mysterious worketh in *them*, &c. . . . Nothing can be concluded hence against the *septenary* number of sacraments: unless, by parity of argument, we are to conclude from St. Austin's reasoning (contra Parmen. ii. c. 13) that there are no other sacraments than baptism and *order*.

oil should be as much insisted on at baptism as the cup at the Eucharistic rite. "It is no more distinct." Now, *we* are mutilators of the sacrament and what not, because we do not administer the cup. What must the Church of England be, which uses water only at baptism? If anything could show the adventurous spirit of a polemic in its full light, it would be this example. To procure St. Gregory as a witness to the binary number of sacraments, the cup—whose administration is held to be indispensable—is brought down to an equality with that which is never used by the Anglicans for a sacramental purpose !*

After some remarks on our tenet regarding the necessity of intention in the minister of the sacraments, (remarks which show that Mr. Perceval is not master of the question he treats of) and a glance at "the many avowed infidels that have been found in the ranks of our priesthood," (kind, generous, and honest man!) we are told that "she (the Catholic Church) has placed the communicants at the mercy of the baker's and vintner's intention, and any malevolent person who supplies the wine and wafers to be used in the Lord's supper, has it in his power, according to our rubrics, to deprive the communicants of the grace of the sacrament." We might demur to this statement; but we will accept it as true. And we will put a question or two to our gentle censor. What element does he deem essential to baptism? Water at least, if not water and *oil*. Is it impossible for a malevolent person to substitute another fluid in the parish font? It is not impossible. Where, then, would be the baptism? What element does Mr. Perceval require for the sacramental cup? Unless he has attained to the spiritual light of some of his brethren at home and abroad, we suppose wine, and *wine of the grape*. The cup is, moreover, essential to the sacrament: without it, there is at best merely "half-communion." How can we appeal to any one whether "a fearful door is not opened to doubt and hesitation," when the adulteration practised by vintners is considered; a fraud which cannot be so narrowly watched when the supply is large. We need say nothing of the hands through which the wine is to pass, or of the practice (which we have good reason to believe not uncommon), of furnishing mere factitious wine to the communion

* That St. Gregory held confirmation to be a sacrament altogether distinct from baptism is most manifest from his sacramentary, (in *Sabbato Sancto*, p. 111, *seq.* t. 5. Opp. Ed. Antw. 1615), where the prayer of invocation is the same as that of the Roman Pontifical.—See also the 9th and 26th letters of the third book, t. 4, pp. 102 and 111.

table, and this, too, with the knowledge of the clergyman.* Now let the Rector of Horseley make his option. Wine of the grape is not essential to the holy sacrament, or the people of his communion may be, and often are, deprived of the sacramental cup (which is nevertheless an integral and essential part of the ordinance). Let him adopt the first, and we ask him for his warrant, and where he will stop? Let him take the second, then we ask him where is the reason in his diatribe against our rubrics? Questionless, there are malevolent men; there have been infidels in the ranks of our priesthood, as there was a *traitor* amongst those chosen by Christ himself; there *may* be among Mr. Perceval's brethren some who treat religion as a mockery:—still, as Mr. P. has told us elsewhere, “God's care for the congregations is greater than that of those to whom He has entrusted them: He watches over them to defeat the evil which would naturally result from the conduct of their responsible guardians.”†

Our author conceives he has totally disposed of our tenet, that confirmation, extreme unction, and matrimony, were instituted by Christ. His reasoning is very compendious. Our theologians, and Dr. Doyle nominatim, confess that the precise time of their institution is uncertain;‡ therefore they cannot be proved to be ordinances of Christ's institution. There is more despatch than logic here. Will Mr. P. determine the precise time when our Lord instituted the sacrament of baptism? Our divines are not uniform in their answer to the question§: he will perhaps reply magisterially in a trice; but we can tell him he must be prepared to meet the objections which will crowd around him. The scholastic divines are less trenchant and summary than the rector; but they are better reasoners,—more wary, more candid. Whilst we are on this subject, let us refer to his inconsiderate bitterness against the *Catechismus ad Parochus*. That work,

* The reader must excuse these details, and some others into which we shall shortly enter. We are forced into them in both instances, in order to reply to objections which are commonly presented to the *vulgar* in rancorous tracts, but which an adversary who values his character should abstain from alleging. We may here add to what we have said above, that it is equally in the power of an infidel parson and an infidel priest to mutilate or suppress the *form* of the sacrament. Unless Mr. P. is prepared to assert, that no such mutilation or suppression can invalidate the sacrament, he must allow that the Protestant has in this respect no advantage over the Catholic. Lastly, before he repeats his summary condemnation of the 11th canon of Sess. vii. (p. 369), let him ask himself whether he believes that the mere rehearsing of the form and application of the element *in derision* or *in jest* would be conferring a sacrament? We hardly think he would. Now it was against this “monstrous and fearful notion” that the synod's anathema was levelled.

† Peace Offering, p. 37.

‡ Pp. 371, 384, 404.

§ See Billuart. de Bap. Diss. i. art. 2.—Dens, § 2.

excellent as it is, is not however a symbolical book.* And as it professes to draw from ancient ecclesiastical sources, we may say in its regard what the canonists say of Gratian's *Decretum* "What is contained in the book has that value which it would have out of it and no other. Quotations from Scripture, pontifical decrees, &c. hold therein that intrinsic value and import which belong to them; admittance of a doubtful or spurious passage invests such passage with no authority."† The *Catechismus* having been drawn up before criticism had demonstrated that a very considerable number of decrees were falsely ascribed to the Popes of the early ages of the Church, it can occasion no surprise that some unauthentic documents should have found admittance into its pages. These slight blemishes, however, detract but little from the value of the work, which, for precision, clearness, comprehensiveness, devotional feeling and eloquence, may rank among the best in ecclesiastical literature. We have made these remarks, that the reader may be better prepared to estimate the candour and temper with which Mr. Perceval criticizes a passage. Let us quote his words:

"But as if it were not enough to affirm, on pain of anathema, the fact of, an institution which they are *confessedly* unable to prove, the *Catechismus ad Parochos* makes it a *lie* with a circumstance in order to give it more credit. 'A pastoribus explicandum est Christum Dominum non solum ejus auctorem fuisse, sed *sancto Fabiano Pont. Rom. teste* chrismatis ritum et verba quibus in ejus administratione Catholica Ecclesia utitur precepisse.' And because this *barefaced* accumulation of unwarranted statements might stagger the simple priests who would be at *their wil's end* to make good their assertion, the Catechism suggests how this may be done, 'Quod quidem *is*† facile probari poterit qui confirmationem sacramentum esse *confitentur*: cum sacra omnia mysteria humanæ naturæ vires superent, nec ab alio quàm a Deo possint institui.' Ordinary mortals would have said, the institution proves the sacrament: no, says the Roman Catechism; the sacrament (which we assume) proves its own institution, *which was the point in dispute.*"—p. 371.

We are so accustomed to the bitter language of this minister of the gospel, that we do not resent it. All we ask for, is a fair construction of the Latin text. We do not quarrel with his intermingling his commentary with the quotation. Perhaps it was *system*, perhaps it was irrepressible anger that prompted him to interpose; however it be, our good critic has made *two*

* Mr. Perceval seems aware of this, p. 413.

† Devoti Proleg. § 79.

† Mr. P. seems to us to have interpreted these words as *ab is*, referring the pronoun to the catechists not to the catechumens. If so, he has lost sight of the usage of the best Latin writers.

sentences out of *one*, and accommodated his punctuation accordingly. The change may not be very important, though the construction which belongs to the passage will more evidently appear, if the sentence be suffered to remain unbroken. Now the text avouches two things: the divine institution of confirmation, and the divine ordaining of a rite and form now in use. The second assertion is grounded* on a testimony, which, at the present day, will be regarded as unauthentic; *the first* was not only admitted as true by those to whom the Catechism was addressed, but regarded as demonstrable by evidence. The Catechism did not address itself to those who denied confirmation to be a sacrament; but to those who were to instruct those who *already* believed it to be one. They who believed it to be a sensible sign of inward grace, would readily admit its divine origin; might be readily convinced that it could not be a rite of human institution. They who admit that by baptism original sin is cancelled, and spiritual adoption and grace obtained, must allow baptism to be a divine ordinance. The admission of a rite to be a sacrament involves an admission of the divine origin of that rite. Will Mr. Perceval deny that it is fair to reason upon admitted premises? His work proceeds on the supposition that such reasoning is legitimate. Can he be ignorant of the fact, that the doctrine of original sin was often inferred from the rite of baptism; and that, vice versâ, the necessity of baptism is inferred from the doctrine of original sin? The method varies according to the opinion or faith of those with whom we have to treat. Were we reasoning with a deist, we should not appeal to the gospel as to the inspired Word of God; were we reasoning with a Socinian, we should not adduce the Athanasian creed as an authority; in reasoning with Mr. Perceval, we should not infer that confirmation was of divine institution because it is a sacrament, *unless* we had premised, or intended to give, a proof that it is a sacrament; but to a Catholic, who, believing the outward rite to be an established means of sanctification, ignorantly supposed it to be of primitive, indeed but human, origin, we should address the argument above given: *quod illi facile probaretur*; he would readily *acquiesce in it*.

It is a trite remark, that those who are most bitter in their vituperation of others for a supposed fault, are the very men who ought to crave pardon for proved offences. The reader has

* No candid person will hastily reject this latter assertion, because the testimony incidentally cited (*sancto Fabiano teste*) is not genuine. The assertion may be sustained on better grounds. It is evident that it is the *first* assertion alone that the close of the sentence regards: in fact, Mr. P. considers the *second* as "a circumstance."

seen how insultingly Mr. Perceval can make a charge, and with what reason he can support it: we shall now prefer an impeachment against him, which we shall substantiate, without mixing invective in our pleading. The Council of Trent (Sess. xiv. cap. 4) declares that although it may *sometimes happen* that contrition (as before defined) is *perfected* by charity, and reconciles a man to God before the sacrament of penance be actually received, nevertheless this reconciliation is not to be ascribed to contrition without the wish for the sacrament, which wish is therein included. Our critic (p. 378) infers, without limitation, "that contrition with the wish for the *rite* of penance will reconcile a sinner to God without the rite." What the council affirms to be occasional, he interprets to be universal: what is pronounced of *perfect* contrition he explains to be said of contrition in general. This is not very fair; but there is more to come. Mr. P. represents the council as teaching "that the *mere* fear of punishment is a sufficient disposition for attaining the grace of God in the sacrament" (of Penance.)—*ib.* Let us turn back to the decree. "Imperfect contrition, which is called attrition, since it is commonly conceived either from a consideration of the foulness of sin, or the fear of hell and punishment, if it exclude the will to sin and have hope of pardon.....is a gift of God and impulse of the Holy Ghost, not indeed as yet indwelling, but only moving, assisted whereby the penitent prepares to himself the way of righteousness.".....After citing the Ninivites as an instance, it proceeds: "Wherefore certain persons do falsely calumniate Catholic writers, as if they had taught that the sacrament of penance conferred grace without a good disposition on the part of the receivers, (a doctrine) which the Church of God never taught or believed," &c.....Let any one who can comprehend the meaning of words compare the council's description of attrition with that which Mr. Perceval has palmed upon it. The one can apply only to a *convert*, imperfect as may be his religious sentiments: the other would suit a paricide quaking with the fear of what is to ensue, but exulting in the deed of blood, and meditating how he may perpetrate new horrors.—Before Mr. Perceval presumes rudely to pluck the mote from his brother's eye, let him cast the beam out of his own.

Let us pass to what he says on confession. In his *Peace Offering* he speaks highly of its beneficial effects; of its promoting the interests of piety and true religion; and deploras the relaxation of ecclesiastical discipline in this particular.* "It has fallen into such disuse, that while men refuse to confess to their spiritual guides, they too often leave the world without

confessing to God himself." The repelling (as is common) all idea of particular confession, is "a *fatal* pertinacity." Many "persist in the denial of sins which it is certain they have committed, and choose rather to leave the world with the smouldering fire in their breasts, and a *lie* in their mouths, than make any acknowledgment of any sin which they hope they have contrived to conceal." And in answer to a "hackneyed cry," it is declared *better be priest-ridden than pride-ridden*.* This was the moral theology of 1829. In the interim, the rector, "old as he is, has put himself to school," and (seemingly) attended a course of lectures at Exeter Hall. He can now refer to casuists, to *Dens' Theology*; condemn the minute investigation of sins which passes in the confessional, and pretty plainly insinuate that it is a school of immorality. The checks the Popes have imposed on a nefarious desecration of the ministerial function, he considers too "feeble" to afford *any* security." All this mischief he traces to a compulsory system on our part—a system the operation of which, we take leave to tell him, he grossly misrepresents. *He* would only *encourage* the burthened sinner to relieve his conscience: thus "many a mind would depart the world at peace with itself and with God."

If Mr. P. choose to degrade his character, by trading with the O'Sullivans and M'Ghees, it is no concern of ours. But we must remind him, that he has not put the question on the right footing. If the Catholic believes that confession is the necessary remedy for mortal sin committed after baptism, he readily submits (if he value his soul) to the full disclosure of his guilt, whether of deed, or word, or thought. A judicial office is held by the priest: and that office has its rules. The priest's power is recognized to interrogate the penitent, that the disclosure *may* be—what the penitent firmly believes it *ought* to be—entire. It would be more correct to designate auricular confession in our Church as obligatory than as *compulsory*:—we apprehend that the *compulsory* system may more truly be said to be acted upon by those who, whilst they acknowledge that they have no authority to inquire, importunately exact disclosures from one who does not believe them to be enjoined by God's law; from a sick man, writhing with bodily pain, and agonized at the prospect of dissolution, to whom, when in health, they never proposed similar interrogatories. And why, it may be asked, should his refusal to answer be censured, since the confession is optional: or why, by this novel

* Page 74. In the same page we read that "the *sale* of indulgences, perverted as it has been, is still in some respects useful." What anathemas would our Horseley divine now launch on a Catholic who should talk thus.

and *unauthorized* inquisition, should a temptation to lying be put in his way. Look at the two systems in another aspect. Mr. Perceval would *encourage* the burdened sinner to relieve his conscience. Of what? Of sins which we forbear to particularize. The cases where the disclosure must be of this character are frequent. Well, here the Protestant minister and the priest resemble each other in their position; with this important difference, however, that the latter is under the solemn persuasion that he is acting as the delegate of Christ: the former has not this persuasion. It will hardly be denied, then, that the one is more secured from contaminating influence than the other. As we wish to conduct our inquiry with a Christian spirit, we shall not be seduced by Mr. Perceval's insinuations, to retort on the ministers of his sect. We shall content ourselves with observing, that the best things may be depraved by men's malice, but such depravations are not sufficient reasons against what is abused: that the existence of laws does not prove a multitude of transgressors: and that, as with some other accusations, so with the one in question,—it may be wantonly alleged upon the most groundless surmise, readily entertained by malevolent prejudice, and but with difficulty rebutted by innocence. The Catholic priesthood's course lies *per infamiam et bonam famam*, and they pursue it; they are reviled, and they entreat; they are cursed, and they bless.

It was our intention to speak of the *bond of secrecy*, which has, in fact, a close connexion with our theme. Mr. Perceval, who deplores "the scandalous prostitution of the office of confessor, so common, yet so systematic, in these days,"* (he is speaking of Protestant ministers betraying the confidence of prisoners in gaol), may rest assured that the *general* observance of *strict* secrecy is compatible only with a persuasion of the divine origin of confession. We could prove our assertion, but we are called off by Mr. Perceval himself to other questions relative to the Council of Trent.

It is evident from his construction of the 3d and 9th canons of the 14th session, that he does not understand what he has set himself to refute. In the former, the Council purposed to stigmatize the error of those who distorted the text (John xx. 23) to interpret it as a commission to preach the gospel. Has St. Cyprian given it that interpretation in the passage cited by our author? No. But he applies it to baptism as well as to absolution.† There is no conflict between his words and those of

* Peace Offering, 70. The whole passage will repay a careful perusal.

† "*Utrumque* in interpretatione hujus loci recte conjunxit Cyprianus," Ep. 73, says Grotius on John xx. The 73rd is the Ep. to Julianus, from which Mr. Perceval has

the canon. For the latter does not restrict the text to the single sacrament of penance. No exposition save that which was *contrary* to the deduction on the power to absolve is therein reprobated. It is usual with our East Horseley divine to imagine that the assertion of one principle is overborne by another, if the two differ: the divines at Trent supposed two contrary or contradictory propositions necessary to such a result. Explain the text as referring to baptism, if you please, but explain it also as the Fathers are wont to do, as referring to penance also.

In the 9th canon, the Council anathematized those who should assert that the priest's sacramental absolution was not a judicial act, but a *bare* ministration of pronouncing and declaring that the confitent's sins *have been* remitted.* There can be no doubt (indeed, even Sarpi has admitted it) that the canon was intended to apply to the Lutherans, who considered the remission of sins to be obtained by a firm belief of their remission. The act of the priest must in such case be purely declaratory. But does an act of this nature answer either to the idea of loosening and forgiving, or to that of a sacrament, or to the form of absolution, whether in the Greek, the Roman, or the Anglican liturgy? In the two last, there is an express appeal to "power" or "authority." Power or authority, of what? Of declaring that to be done which has been done! It is downright burlesque and profaneness to interpret a commission, given in the terms and manner in which that contained in John xx. was given, as extending no farther than this. We are far removed—as far as any of our adversaries—from the impious notion that any man can of himself forgive sin. But we maintain,† that, inheriting from

quoted a *mutilated* fragment. St. Cyprian having recited the text, concludes: "Unde intelligimus non nisi præpositis et in evangelicâ lege ac dominicâ ordinatione fundatis liceres baptizare et remissam peccatorum dare, *foris autem nec ligari aliquid posse nec solvi, ubi non sit qui aut ligare possit aut solvere*," p. 124. Ed. Rigal. The "*binding and loosing*" must refer to something distinct from baptism: the *remissa peccatorum* is, therefore, not the remission of original sin,—at least, not exclusively. Compare the expressions in the sequel of the Epistle, p. 125 and 128.

* Will Mr. P. condescend to revise his *translation* of this canon and the punctuation? (p. 283), which must certainly convey to the mind of the mere English reader (or to any other reader who does not closely compare it with the original) a meaning in several particulars totally foreign to the council's intention.

† Precisely the argument of St. Ambrose: "In baptismo utique remissio peccatorum omnium est: quid interest utrum per pœnitentiam an per lavacrum hoc *jus* sibi datum sacerdotes vindicent?" (De Pœn. i. c. 8, p. 400, tom. ii.) A few lines above, St. Ambrose quotes Mark xvi, 17 and 18, and observes thereupon: "Omnia ergo dedit (Christus) sed nulla in his hominis *potestas* est, ubi divini *muneris gratia* viget." We quote this passage here as serving to explain a sentence which, as will be seen presently, Mr. P. alleges from this Father. As usual, he suppresses what would show the citation to be irrelevant. We give it entire. St. Ambrose proves the divinity of the Holy Ghost, from sins being forgiven by Him. After quoting John xx, he ob-

the Apostles the office of "ministers of Christ, and dispensers of the mysteries of God," the priest,—as in the sacrament of baptism he releases from *original* sin, and imparts the grace of God,—so in that of penance he looses the baptized penitent from *actual* sin, and imparts the grace of God. The act of loosing is preceded by a *self-accusation*; analogously, then, it bears the name of a *judicial* act, and the scripture texts warrant the use of the term. In short, if grace be obtained in the sacrament of penance, the priest, who is the minister of the sacrament, must be a co-operator: his function, then, cannot consist in *bare* declaration.

The quotations which Mr. Perceval has accumulated from the fathers, impugn not our doctrine, but his own fiction. Priests are ministers and dispensers, not masters, say they: and we with them. God alone can cancel iniquity: the Prophet declared this ages ago, the fathers repeat it, and we after them. But the claim of a *delegated* office and power may well consist with this profession. Otherwise, let Mr. P. show that Christ *could* not empower any one to forgive in his name. And if he will explain the *jus potestatis*, which St. Ambrose denies to be exercised by men, to signify *delegated* authority instead of *essential inherent* power,* let him abide the consequences, and see his own Church condemned for arrogant presumption. For we read that God "hath left *power* to his *Church* to absolve all sinners, &c."* St. Jerome's lash might fall meritedly enough on some daring and ignorant pretenders of his time, but leaves us untouched: for this good reason, that their folly is not our Church doctrine. If Mr. P. will contend that the alleged parallel between the priests of the old and of the new law, implies that there is no difference between them,† we will beg him to try his principle of interpre-

serves, "Homines autem in remissionem peccatorum ministerium suum exhibent non jus alicujus potestatis exercent. Neque enim in suo, sed in Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti nomine peccata dimittant. Isti rogant, divinitas donat: humanum enim obsequium, sed munificentia supernæ est potestatis." (Tom. ii. 693.) All that we have given in *italics* Mr. Perceval omits.—We may refer the reader to a remarkable passage of St. Chrysostom on this subject. (De Sac. iii, 384, seq. tom. i.) οὐ γὰρ ὁρ' ἂν ἡμὰς ἀναγεννώσι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ μετὰ ταῦτα συγχωρεῖν ἔχουσιν ἐξουσίαν ἀμαρτημάτων.

* Book of Com. Prayer. Visit of Sick.—Hear the learned Pearson (on the tenth art. of the Creed): "The Church of God, in which remission of sin is preached, doth not only promise it at first by the laver of regeneration, but afterwards also upon the virtue of repentance; and to deny the Church this power of absolution is the heresy of Novatian."

† The difference is clearly stated by St. Chrysostom, as follows: (De Sac. Ed. Montf. i. 384) "The Jewish priests were empowered to free from a bodily leprosy, or rather not to free from it, but to examine those who were freed: whereas these (i. e. Christian priests) have been empowered not to examine the removal of spiritual defilements, but to remove them altogether."

tation on a few texts of Scripture: John vi. 57, Ephes. v. 23, 24, for example. His producing this passage from St. Jerome, deserves our acknowledgements: we shall have occasion for it presently, and shall deduce some inferences which he will not easily elude.

The Council of Trent has anathematized those “who shall deny that sacramental confession was instituted or is necessary to salvation by divine ordinance, or shall say that the custom of confessing secretly to the priest alone, which the Catholic Church always has observed from the beginning, and does observe, is at variance with the institution and command of Christ, and is of human invention.”

Mr. Perceval twits the Tridentine fathers for not remembering that “in the Latin Church, as late as 813, it was matter of dispute whether there was need to confess to a priest at all,” p. 385. He then gives us an extract from the Council of Châlons, which he supposes to leave the whole matter to each one's discretion, and concludes with the sprightly question: “was Leo the Third asleep, that he could suffer such heresy to be broached and not denounced?” There is no need of supposing that Leo was asleep, good Mr. Perceval, but *you must have shut your eyes* whilst the book from which you quote was before you!

The 32nd canon of this Council of Châlons† condemns the want of integrity or full disclosure of all sins to the priest in confession. Because man transgresses sometimes by internal passion, sometimes by carnal frailty, it infers that both kinds of sins are diligently to be examined into, that the confession may be *complete* by the manifestation of both, to-wit that those things of which the body has been the agent, and those in which thought only is the offender, may be confessed. And because of the subtlety and frequent grievousness of internal sins, it insists on the importance of the confitent's being instructed how to make his confession on the eight principal and most ordinary vices.

The reader will admit that there was no heresy here to startle Pope Léo out of his slumber. The canon might have passed at the General Council of Trent. He will wish to know how Mr.

* Labbe vii. 1278. Compare canons 34, 38, 45, all of which ascertain the usage of confession, and canon 46, which with sufficient plainness inculcates it as preparatory to the holy communion. “purificans corpus animamque suam, præparet se ad percipiendum tantum sacramentum.”—Compare also Egbert's “Succinct Dialogue,” written a century before, “ut non solum clerici . . . sed etiam laici . . . ad confessores suos pervenirent,” &c.—Wilkins i. 86.

Perceval has disposed of it? Disposed of it? By bravely passing it by altogether, never giving a hint of the existence of such a document! The ensuing canon he has honoured with 'more attention, yet with the prudent caution of *suppressing* that clause which explains its import and baffles his argument. The reader shall judge for himself. The 33rd canon, then, states that some assert that confession of sin is due to God alone, whilst others believe that such confession must be made to the priests. That the Church combines both practices; the former being exercised by penitential prayer, the other by fulfilling what the apostle James directs (v. 16). That confession to God expiates sin; that made to the priest shows how sins may be expiated. *For a gracious God sometimes gives health and salvation (to the soul) by the invisible working of his power, sometimes by the operation of physicians.*

It follows, then, from these words which we have printed in *italics*, but which Mr. Perceval has not printed *at all*, but very conveniently reduced to an &c., that the Council believed that the priest did not exercise a bare ministration of declaring the soul's health, but operated that health as an agent of God's appointment: consequently that the sacrament whereof confession is a part was of divine institution. "There were some who said that confession is due to God alone." These "some" were not the Council. That confession to God in prayer is a practice of the Catholic Church at the present day, who will be so absurd as to deny? That a penitent confession to God only may, on some occasions, justify the sinner, the Council of Trent admits, as we have seen. That auricular confession was practised in virtue of a scriptural precept, this very canon bears witness; and its predecessor requires the confession to be full and entire.

Where is "the heresy broached" in this canon? There was, indeed, a grievous error in those who made the assertion which the canon recites. But the error is corrected by the canon. Confess to God only was the maxim of the one. Confess to God and to his ministers was the corrective reply of the other. Will Mr. Perceval abide by this rule? We have no more to say. Will he reject it? Then how does the authority tell against us? He may talk of slumbering popes. *Infelix astutia! Dormientem Papam narras! Verè ipse obdormisti qui scrutando talia defecisti!* That the popes of the ninth century were fully alive to the importance of confession, is manifest from a homily which Leo IV addressed to all bishops, to be by them notified to their clergy. It is preserved entire (with a slight addition of

later date) in the *Ordo ad Synodum* in the Roman Pontifical.* This discourse enjoins the clergy to bring their flocks to confession at the beginning of Lent. We could retrograde from the ninth century to the second, and produce vouchers for the practice of confessing secret sins. We could fill our pages with the earnest exhortations of homilists and tractators, conjuring penitents to make a full and free disclosure of their lives, and warning them against the criminal insincerity of a half-confession, or the delusion that their sorrow, without the aid of the divine and healing rite, would retrieve lost grace. For the expiation of venial sins there are *other* means at hand.† And it is of *this* that the fathers commonly speak, when they recommend prayer as sufficient for the cancelling of sin.‡ On the remission of mortal sin they speak otherwise. They insist on prayer, on tears, on amendment, but on confession also. We will give one or two proofs. St. Austin§ regards the pretence of the adulterer who appeals to God for the sincerity of his penance, but applies not to the absolving virtue of the Church for his pardon, as a pretence subversive of the words of Christ; and elsewhere, he calls upon the man who is contaminated with any of the works of the flesh, (Gal. v.) to come to the Church authorities, and receive the due injunction of the satisfaction which he is to perform, at the hands of these dispensers of the sacraments.|| It cannot be said that canonical and public penance is referred to in these words.¶ Then, St. Jerome** represents priests as exer-

* The Homily may be seen in Labbe viii. 33-38.

† Con. Trid. Sess. xiv. cap. 5.

‡ Aug. Euchir, § 19, t. vi. 163. Sermo. 352. T. V. 954. Ed. Antw. 1700.

§ Sermo 391. T. V. 1054.

|| Sermo 351. Tom. v. 947.

¶ St. Austin has been treating of the expiation of sin in baptism, and that of daily, but not deadly, sins by daily penance. In the fourth chap. (945) he comes to speak of another species of guilt, for which he prescribes a different course of atonement. This is, severe self-scrutiny, sorrow of heart, refraining from the altar, amendment of life, recourse to the keys of the church. The pastors of the Church are to determine the satisfaction to be performed; and if the scandal of the sin and the utility of the Church require a *public* penance, the sinner should submit to it with humility. (The sins which St. Austin has enumerated were not all of them visited with public penance.) The sequel of the discourse shows that the Homilist had principally in view, not notorious sinners, but those whose guilt was known to few, or altogether secret. We may add, that the close of the discourse furnishes an unanswerable testimony on the necessity of confession. "Non enim sufficit mores in melius mutare et a factis malis recedere, nisi etiam de his quæ facta sunt satisfiat Deo per poenitentiam dolorem, per *humilitatis genitum*, per contriti cordis sacrificium, cooperantibus eleemosynis." What does St. Austin understand by the *humilitatis genitum*? He will tell us: "Certiores sunt claves ecclesiæ quam corda regum: quibus clavibus quodcumque in terrâ solvitur etiam in cælo solum promittitur. Et multo est honestior *humilitas* quâ se quisque *humiliat Ecclesiæ Dei*: et labor minor imponitur, et nullo temporalis mortis periculo mors Æterna vitatur."—950.

** Ep. ad Heliod. in Eccles. cap. 10.

cising a species of judgment before the day of final judgment; as having the grace of healing the soul from a secret poison;—a grace which would be rendered abortive by the shame of confessing. In a passage which Mr. Perceval himself has quoted, the same father compares the ministry of the priest of the new law who absolves, to that of the priest of the old who inspected the lepers and pronounced them clean, after certain expiatory rites to which God annexed a salutary effect. Now, the priest of the old law could perform his ministry only on those who submitted to it; that *all* afflicted with the leprosy were bound to present themselves for inspection, is equally certain, as well as that a mere vague and general declaration of distemper was not sufficient. It is fair, then, to conclude from these words of St. Jerome, that he regarded specific confession as necessary for all suffering under *spiritual* leprosy;—for all bearing the guilt of mortal sin. No one can read St. Ambrose's *Treatise on Penance*, without perceiving abundant indications of the practice of auricular confession. We would not, in reasoning with a *contentious* disputant, insist upon the applicability of the declaration in the sixth chapter of the second book: "*Solvit criminum nexus verecunda confessio peccatorum*," but we challenge any adversary to construe the close of the ninth and commencing words of the tenth chapters* otherwise, unless he be determined to wrench words from their meaning at all events. The writer is speaking (§ 87) of those who, though not condemned to canonical penance, were nevertheless inhibited, and deservedly so, from receiving the Eucharist. To obtain admission to the sacrament of the altar, they asked for penance, urged the priest to give them absolution;—a condescension to such importunities is described as injurious to the priest and to the applicant, and the warning words of Christ (Matt. vii. 6) are cited for the prevention of it. The reasoning which the author adopts at the commencement of the tenth chapter, proceeds on the usage of private confession as a recognized principle: "*Cum te non pudeat peccata tua homini quem lateas confiteri*."† Mr. Perceval might have consulted this treatise when he set himself to examine whether absolution were a bare ministerial act. He would have found the Novatians maintaining that very notion which he has endeavoured to represent as belonging to SS. Cyprian and Ambrose. *They* professed to reverence God by reserving to Him alone the power of remitting sin. And how does St. Ambrose refute them? By alleging that the Church has a delegated trust, which it were profane to return back to the

* II. 434, seq.

† Ib. 435.

giver "commissum munus refundere:" by quoting the commission (John xx. 22), and showing how the Church fulfils it, and that she must necessarily fulfil *in the same manner* both its parts. "Dominus enim PAR JUS et solvendi esse voluit et ligandi, qui utrumque *pari conditione* permisit . . . Ecclesiæ utrumque licet, hæresi utrumque non licet; JUS enim hoc solis *permissum SACERDOTIBUS* EST."^{*}

This passage is somewhat more germane to the matter in hand than Mr. Perceval's truncated quotation from the venerable bishop's commentary on St. Luke. He has given a short fragment in p. 384, another in p. 386. In neither place has he considered the drift and purpose of the writer whose words he transcribed. St. Ambrose has been extenuating the sin of St. Peter's denial. He proceeds to observe, that the Apostle did *not* extenuate it, but accused himself, and grieved and wept. That we have no record of his words (of excuse) but of his tears; that we read of his tears, but not of his *apology*. "Lachrymas Petri lego, non lego *satisfactionem*."[†] But that what cannot be *defended* may be *expiated*. "Sed quod *defendi* non potest, *ablui* potest." The holy Father proceeds to dilate on the efficacy of tears, as supplying for speech, as intimating what shame dares not farther avow, as conducive to pardon, as *preparatory to prayer*. "Ante flendum est, sic precandum."[‡] If Mr. Perceval consider this passage, and one adduced from St. Chrysostom, (which we shall notice immediately) to be peremptory against the Council of Trent's decision that specific confession is of divine institution, he is indeed easily satisfied. The moderation of his desires with respect to evidence is, indeed, very exemplary here. His demands on the sinner are also very circumscribed. But a little while ago, he was contending for the expediency of an occasional verbal confession: *now*, we are to believe that the whole business of the sinner's reconciliation is accomplished by tears;—tears which *precede even prayer*. So St. Ambrose describes them: but this circumstance Mr. Perceval adroitly omits in his quotation. Indeed, we strongly suspect from his mode of citing the passage, that he intended a sinister attack on confession on the score of morality, and a glance at those edifying topics of p. 383 before alluded to. If so, his procedure is so disingenuous, that it deserves the most

^{*} De Pœn. i. ch. ii. p. 391, *seq.*

[†] The context shows this word to be here synonymous with *defensio*. It can have no reference to "satisfaction" in the sense which Mr. P. attaches to the term, (p. 384.) His sneers (381) at the practice of enjoining works of devotion as penances, are unworthy of serious notice. He may, if he please, turn to Bp. Joseph Butler's celebrated Charge, where the utility of the practice is admitted.

[‡] I. 1523.

indignant reprobation. Be it as it may, the passage proves nothing against us, because it has no reference whatever to oral confession to the ministers of the Church.

Neither is the extract given from St. Chrysostom's fifth discourse against the Anomæans relevant to the subject. The preacher has instanced the case of the justified publican as an example of the efficacy of humility, and he proceeds to exhort his audience to lay open freely and humbly their hearts before God. Alluding, no doubt, to the public courts of justice, he represents the exercise as involving no disgrace before fellow-servants, no forced confession to men; let the book of conscience be unfolded before God: let the soul's wounds be exposed, let their healing be craved.* And this is to set aside the decision of the Council of Trent on the specific confession of sin! Is Mr. P. so unacquainted with our writers on prayer, as to think that this recommendation is at variance with our Church doctrine? What are the exercises of mental prayer as explained by our spiritualists,—what is our nightly examination of conscience, as proposed in all our manuals of devotion, but exemplifications of what St. Chrysostom here suggests? And sure are we, that any one, (unless he have a *formed prejudice* against auricular confession) who is habituated to this daily expansion of the heart before its Maker and self-accusation, will need no very urgent inducements to lay open his conscience to a minister of his God. "As love for Christ displays itself in charitable deeds towards those whom He has placed in his stead, (Matt. xxv. 40) so the sorrow which is according to God, finds its utterance in confession to the vicergerent of God. The internal act of virtuous *resolution* has its complement in a change of life, that of penitential love in outward confession: both manifest themselves in a manner analogous to the nature of things, and as men's sins are not of a general but determinate character, confession must, obviously, be *specific*."†

We intended to lay before our readers some passages from St. Chrysostom on sacramental confession, but we have outrun our prescribed limits, and must, therefore, be content to refer to the passage quoted in a foregoing note. Sufficient evidence has been adduced to show, that specific confession of mortal sin, even though secret or committed only in thought, was no invention of the Council of Trent. The *ecclesiastical* precept of annual confession is a determination of a *divine* law, antecedently

* Tom. i. p. 490. Ed. Montf. The next scriptural instance which he quotes is that of Azarias and his companions (Dan. iii.), where he cites what Mr. Perceval's church calls Apocrypha. It is verse 33 of our Vulgate.

† Möhler.

and independently obligatory on Christians who have forfeited the grace of God : to argue, from the recency of the former, that the latter was not recognized in preceding ages, is as illogical as to infer from the Church's appointment of festival days, or its defining the jurisdiction of bishops, that episcopal authority and religious worship are not of divine appointment. Had Innocent III, and the Council at which he presided, enacted a *mere* disciplinary regulation ;—had they insisted on confession, when the practice was considered as in every case optional ;—had the Catholic world not been fixed in the steady persuasion that the remission of mortal sin was to be obtained only by the power of the keys left to the ministers of the Church by its divine founder,—a persuasion whose existence the hazardous speculations of one or two obscure writers, contradicted by a numerous body of respectable contemporaries, will never disprove—reclamation and opposition would have been aroused. Suppose the Church of England to insist on the practice of yearly self-manifestation, by all and every one of her members : what protests, refusals, evasions, and schisms, would at once ensue ! The bishops and clergy might urge ecclesiastical authority ; but their opponents would be ready with the answer : “ Admitting the utility of unburdening of the conscience, we contend that you have no right to enforce it. The practice is optional, not of divine institution ; it has never been considered as such by us. Were it of God's appointment in any case, the regulation which you have decreed, would have our obedience ; for we allow the Church the power to fix and determine the modes and circumstances of fulfilling a divine injunction. As it is, we protest against a new law proposed as divine, whereas it is merely human ;—a law most oppressive to the conscience, and requiring a humiliation most shocking to our feelings : a yoke which neither ye nor your fathers have borne.”

We have much to say on Mr. Perceval's note respecting Extreme Unction : but we are constrained to limit ourselves to a very few observations. First, Mr. Perceval might have spared himself all his expenditure of criticism on Mark vi. 13, had he understood the expression of the decree, and considered the intention of those who framed it. He has rendered the word “ *insinuatum* ” by “ *implied* : ” he should have said figured, emblemmed, or typified. The acts of the Council demonstratively show, that it never was the intention of the Fathers to infer the sacrament from the special commission given to the Apostles on the occasion recorded in St. Mark. Few of the schoolmen or ancient interpreters quoted that text as a record of the divine institution of the rite ; the Council, whatever the mendacious

Sarpi, may assert, *at no time* considered it as such. Secondly, Why is the opinion of the singular and paradoxical Cardinal Cajetan* to be alleged as countervailing all other interpreters: and his cavil to set aside an exposition which is clearly deduced from the text of St. James? Were Mr. Perceval to infer the divinity of our Lord from John xx. 28, Rom. ix. 5, 1 John v. 20, a Socinian could no doubt muster up authors of the Anglican sect who have done their best or worst to impair the force of such texts. *Therefore*, such texts are never to be alleged! This is only Mr. Perceval's argument retorted upon himself. He can descant at length on the inapplicability of a passage which the Council did not allege as a warrant for the divine institution of a rite: when he comes to the passage on which the recommendation and promulgation are grounded, he skulkingly eludes it under the shelter of one single daring author, ("if Cardinal Cajetan is any authority," p. 382.) Thirdly, that "the holy rite was originally applied *chiefly* to the healing of the body," our author argues, from some expressions in the prayers, and the custom of applying the oil to the part where the pain was greatest. The word *chiefly* is dexterously inserted: our author must admit, at this rate, that some *spiritual* effect was expected. And what is the spiritual effect? we ask him; and on what warrant is it expected?—Now, as to the prayers: if Mr. P. had not been so very sparing in his quotation, his reader would have seen the following words in immediate sequel to those which he has cited:—"Ejusque sana vulnera *atque peccata dimitte* atque dolores cunctos *mentis* et corporis ab eo expelle, plenamque *interius* et *exterius* sanitatem misericorditer redde." The healing of the soul from sin and sorrow is solicited as well as the assuagement of bodily pains. That because the health of the body is prayed for, the rite of anointing was originally applied chiefly for that purpose, we can easily show to be a very absurd inference. Mr. Perceval will not maintain that the chief purpose of the Eucharist is the bodily health or nutriment. And yet he will find in post-communion prayers, transferred from old sacramentaries into the Roman Missal, many supplications to that very effect.† Equally unwarrantable is the inference from the good old usage of applying the consecrated oil to the part most affected with pain. The very sacramentary

* Does Mr. Perceval wish his readers to believe, that Cajetan wrote subsequently to the council? If not: what is the meaning of the word "*since*," &c.—p. 386.

† See the Roman Missal. 8th, 11th, 15th, and 16th Sundays after Pentecost. These same prayers will be found in St. Gregory's Sacramentary, on the 13th, 17th, 20th Sundays. The Ambrosian rite has numerous prayers to the same effect. (Ed. Pamelii, 389, 411, 423.)

which he has quoted, intimates, in the preceding line, that the unction was performed also on the neck, the throat, the breast, the back: and it refers to, and sufficiently warrants, the custom now observed universally amongst us, of anointing the five organs of sense. These various unctions, which have no necessary reference to bodily ailment, as well as the significant prayers which accompanied them, make it "manifest" that it was *not* the healing of the body that was the chief object of the rite. Fourthly, The practice of the Greek Church is neither condemned by us, nor to be held as an argument against us. The first assertion may be proved from the silence of councils: the second from the parallel case of the administration of the Eucharist to infants. That the holy sacrament of the altar was intended for adults principally, is evident; but to make infants partakers of the blessing is forbidden by no scriptural law. Infants are not excluded from the participation, but the precept is not addressed to them. So the text of St. James is an injunction to the sick, but it does not debar those who are in health from the benefit.*

We very reluctantly pass over without animadversion the misstatements of our author on the question of Purgatory† and Indulgences,† and come to the closing note, (p. 413.) The Rector has adhered faithfully to the poet's rule—"Servetur ad imum, qualis ab incepto," &c.—and we are bound to admit that the page is excellent in its way; caustic, overbearing, and braggart. We recommend it, as such, to the study of those who wish to imbue their style and temper with these three amiable qualities. The good sense of the passage is quite another affair: though perhaps that is of less consequence for the Oxford *alumni*, and others, for whose morbid appetite the Rector of East Horseley caters. We request the reader's attention to our statement.

One of the last acts of the Council of Trent, was to call on secular princes to provide for the faithful observance of its disciplinary decrees by their subjects. Whoever will even cursorily review those enactments, will see that in a great variety of matters they would affect civil usages. We need but refer to one particular,—clandestine marriages, to illustrate our meaning. Now, the Council anticipated some difficulties in the reception of these rules, and the event realized the anticipation. As it had enacted a code of canon law differing in many respects from that by which the Church had been hitherto governed, as it doomed to destruction many abuses of long

* See Saintebeuve *De Extr. Unct.* Diss. vii. Art. 1, q. 2.

† Pp. 354, 401.

‡ P. 410.

standing, and strengthened the arm of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, opposition and hindrances were naturally to be expected. And its ordinances being so multifarious and comprehensive, might require exposition for the right application of them to particular cases. Circumstances changed, and the general good of Christendom recommending, modification and alteration might be deemed expedient. Therefore, the Council expresses its confidence that the Pope will provide for the emergency, by the use of those expedients furnished by the Council itself, by calling to his aid serviceable individuals from the countries where the difficulties arise, by convoking a new general council, or adopting any other method to promote the glory of God, and the quiet of the Church.

Now, let us ask, is there any thing absurd in this provision? Or rather, is it not an evidence of the wisdom of those who formed it? The legislative power devolves the supervision of the observance of its enactments on the supreme executive. Should a new case arise, a resource to meet it is provided. Doubts on the construction of a law occur; there is a tribunal to clear them up satisfactorily. It were well if secular legislators would condescend to take an example of prudent foresight from the Fathers of Trent. The Church of England might profit by the lesson: for what authoritative interpretation of its disciplinary canons has she for the querist to refer to?

Let us ask, in the next place, where is the reason of Mr. Perceval's invective on this closing act of the Council? Does he think that the claim of the Council to divine assistance is negatived by a provision of this nature? Had the Apostles at Jerusalem (Acts xv.) referred to St. Peter, or any other of their brethren, the adjudication of any new question which might arise out of their short and simple decree, such a commission would have been a denial that the Holy Ghost had presided over their deliberations! The truth is, that the whole of the Rector's invective rests on a false assumption. The Council alludes to its disciplinary regulations; he, with his usual wilfulness or blundering, makes its refer to its decisions on faith also. Now, we shall bring the dispute to a speedy issue. We have seen that difficulties were contemplated as to the reception of rules of discipline:—the fact of such difficulties having occurred, and the reason why they occurred is well known. Were any difficulties raised to the full and cordial assent of all Catholic countries to the definitions on faith? No: none. And the reason is this: the faith was not *new*: the discipline was. The faith was uniform: the customs which the discipline affected were various in every country. Again: there is a *congregation*

permanently established at Rome for the determination of questions arising out of the decrees of the Council of Trent. Its decisions are published. Will Mr. Perceval show that it has ever attempted to alter the doctrine of the Council, or even to explain its dogmatical decisions? It has done neither. It assists the Sovereign Pontiff in determining questions of discipline only, and in conformity with the laws enacted at Trent.

Thus, Mr. Perceval's assumption falls to the ground, and all the jibes and sneers which spring from such assumption are nothing more nor less than pitiable folly.

Having now completed our review of the second part of his work, we appeal to our readers whether we have not shown that it abounds in perversions of fact and testimony. And it is thus that we are convicted of schism! "*Bene habet: jactu sunt fundamenta defensionis.*" Inconsequential reasoning, self-contradiction, misapplication of several authorities, garbling and mutilating many more; suppression of what ought to be told in fairness, insinuation of that which it would be palpable falsehood to aver; misrepresentation of the questions at issue; wanton imputations, sarcastic style of invective:—such is the *farrago libelli* which the Rector of East Horseley has produced. The "*libel*" or indictment of our accuser is not substantiated. Its opening seemed very alarming: "*vultus erat multa et præclara minantis:*"—but upon comparison of evidence, and cross-examination on the principal of the allegations preferred, the result is—no case made out, except—against the prosecutor. We cannot better describe the *libel* more exactly, than in the words of the learned Harding:—"To confute any part of it, it is easy: by due examination, to stay at every untruth, it is painful. He doth not so much wring us with fastness of close arguments, as he encumbereth us with heap of loose sayings. He presseth not with weight, but troubleth with number. His blows come thick, but his weapons lack edge. Some in old time likened logic to the hand closed together, rhetoric to the hand stretched abroad. Thereof it may be conceived how much we fear this rhetorician. Well may he sweep the dust from our coats with flap of hand; he cannot hurt our bones with stroke of fist. The onset of such an enemy cannot fray us; the chasing of him may put us to some labour."

So wrote Harding of Jewell, and Mr. Perceval is the Jewell of the Church of England of the present day;—resembling his prototype in his tergiversation and method, though less provided with learning or craft to make the worse appear the better reason. Let us turn back and examine one or two of the positions he has advanced in his introductory discourse. A detailed

examination of all would carry us too far; besides, many topics which present themselves for consideration here were discussed in our last number: and we do not wish to lead our readers unnecessarily over the same ground. It appears, then, that the only way by which British and Irish Catholics can clear themselves from the imputation of schism, is "by showing that the Anglican bishops require anything which their own bishops do not require, and which was not required by the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon." (p. xxxii.) It may be as well to remind the reader, that the Catholics of these realms are considered schismatical in an especial degree.* All other Churches in communion with Rome are involved in the same species of guilt, but the term schismatical is applicable to us in a particular sense. It is certainly very gracious to unchurch the majority of Christendom by a stroke of the pen! How the Dissenters will regard the excommunicating ban we know not; but it is evident, that unless schism and Church union can go together,—unless contradictions can be reconciled,—the Church of England, with her *small* number of adherents, is (at this rate) the *sole* Church of Christ—the Catholic Church exclusively.

Now, this Church of England has articles and canons. These articles are to be subscribed by candidates for orders, and others,† in their plain and obvious sense, and assent is to be given to them simply and unequivocally.‡ To the subscribers they are a standard of doctrine from which they are engaged not to deviate. Unless, then, the clergy, and a certain portion of the laity, are to have a separate faith from the rest of the body, all members of the Anglican Church are bound to embrace, implicitly, if not explicitly, the tenets there propounded. It serves nothing to allege that "no opinion is required on these points at baptism or confirmation." The articles are a public formulary, put into every one's hands conjointly with the forms by which public worship is conducted, and their avowed purpose is to procure "the avoidance of diversities of opinion, and the establishing of consent touching true religion." That it rests not with a man's option to admit or reject them; that a little gentle coercion is prepared for their enforcement on the conscience, we may learn from the fifth canon,§—"Whoever shall hereafter affirm, that any of the nine-and-thirty articles agreed upon, &c. are in *any part* superstitious or erroneous, or such as he may not with a good conscience subscribe unto, let him be *excommunicated*

* P. 31.

† Laymen at the universities, for example.

‡ Tomline, ii. 573.

§ P. 22. Ed. 1713.

ipso facto, and not restored but only by the Archbishop, after his repentance and public revocation of such his *wicked error*.*

It is held then, to be sinful to affirm that any clause of the articles is erroneous, and such affirmation entails excommunication. And observe that this is not a regulation of external police, in order to quiet disputes and contentious wranglings. The affirmation is pronounced to be a *wicked error*. "Wicked error" in matters of belief must exclude from the kingdom of Christ above, and a rightful excommunication excludes from his kingdom here below.† Here, then, we find the Church of England to be as trenchant in her decision against avowed impugners as our own Church. Will it then be said that her members may *think* as they please, provided they abstain from the obnoxious affirmation? This scheme is latitudinarian, and frustrates the purpose for which the articles were framed—"the avoidance of diversities of *opinion*."

The question is not what the Anglican bishops of the present day may require or not require:—the question is, what deference does the Church of England, *according to its constituent principles*, challenge for its definitions and decisions. Mr. Perceval might be glad to have our adhesion on any terms: but his own book bears testimony to the fact, that his fellow-religionists are not all of like mind. We occasionally hear of some half-crazed or *suspended* priest, or some ignorant and destitute layman, quitting our communion for that of the Church of England. But we invariably have the information, that he "read his recantation," or "that he renounced the errors of the Church of Rome, and embraced those of the Established Church," (to copy the whimsical phrase of one of our journalists on a well-known occasion of this nature.) Mr. Perceval's brethren also regard some of our tenets as fundamental errors. He may argue out the question with them if he please: we care not how the point be settled, but we must be allowed to express our opinion, that their authority is of equal value with his, and that they can at least claim the praise of consistency. For why, since infallibility is not asserted for the Anglican Church, should they keep separate from, and protest against, a society of believers far more numerous than their own, except in the persuasion that the errors of that society are fundamental, while the errors of

* The 141 canons were "ratified, confirmed and established" by James I.—Every minister is charged to read them in the parish church once a-year, and the church authorities are warned to see them duly observed, and not to *be sparing to execute penalties*.

† See Art. 33.

their own (supposing any to exist) are comparatively unimportant? Errableness in a Church, or even actual error, unless it corrupt vital truths, is not considered a sufficient warrant for separation. Try the consistency of their system by an example. The Catholic professes, regarding the Eucharist, "that there is a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, of Christ, —which change the Catholic Church calls Transubstantiation." Now, how can this tenet be regarded as a non-fundamental error, if it be true (as the 28th article declares) that "Transubstantiation is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, and overthroweth the nature of a sacrament"? To maintain a doctrine clearly unscriptural and subversive of the nature of the most excellent and salutary ordinance of religion, is surely to impair grievously the *foundations* of Christ's religion. That doctrine, and all others in the same category (the articles profess to furnish a good list of such) must, questionless, be renounced, if the Church of England's articles be true. Avouching them to be true, pledged to maintain them as true, the clergy, who insist on a disclaimer of Transubstantiation from those who are known to have held it, act, with consistency; by admitting to their communion any who are known to have held it, until they have evidence that the clearly unscriptural and deleterious error has been renounced, would be a compromise of principle. It would open the door to those who would inwardly deem what the 5th canon declares it to be a "wicked error" to affirm.

Here is a sufficient answer to the first part of Mr. Perceval's challenge. The Church of England does require what is contradictory to that which we hold as divine truth. It makes the negation of our assertions imperative on its adherents, laity as well as clergy; it must, unless it patronize deceit and falsehood in its members, make a renunciation of our doctrines in certain cases an indispensable term of communion. We opine this to be something more than our bishops require. Pass we now to the second member of the challenge.

Why has Mr. Perceval taken his stand at the Council of Chalcedon? Why not ascend to that of Nice, or higher? For what reason will he refuse to come down lower? The decisions at Ephesus and Chalcedon are, it seems, to hold good: pray, why not those of the great Lateran and Florentine synods? Let it be remembered, that these last were as full congresses of universal Christendom as the former. It was the Catholic Church met in council, or the Catholic Church was no where. It will not avail to declaim against the assessors of these councils, as innovators and forcers of conscience. The 139th and 141st

canons of the Anglican Church, which claim so much for a *national* synod, and sharply rebuke and condemn the "depravers" thereof, read a good lesson against this declamation, and justify us in maintaining that these two large ecclesiastical assemblies held the same position with respect to the Universal Church, dispersed, as the two which our author has appealed to, and are entitled to the same deference. The charge of innovation and spiritual tyranny was as ready for the Nestorians' or Eutychians' use in the fifth age as for the Protestants' in the nineteenth. It is so easy to ring the changes upon the "*quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus,*" and to abuse the admonition "*state super vias antiquas:*" easy to say, "produce* a council or ecclesiastical writer who enforced an assent to any one of these propositions, on pain of anathema, which you establish as articles of faith and terms of communion." The councils which Mr. Perceval has made the standards of orthodoxy, knew how to deal with these evasions. John of Antioch professed himself the champion of the pure unmixed Nicene doctrine:† but this profession did not satisfy the Fathers at Ephesus:—"condemn Nestorius's doctrine, which we condemn," was the answer.‡ Nay more: at Chalcedon, Theodoret's protestation against Nestorianism and Eutychianism were judged unsatisfactory, till he had distinctly anathemized Nestorius.§ Again, at the Council of Constantinople, there were framed definitions which, agreeably to Mr. Perceval's theory, might have been most reasonably demurred to. "Why, (it might have been said) why not leave the creed of Nice in its original state? That creed has pronounced nothing on the virginal conception and birth of Christ: nor on the Godhead of the Spirit. On this latter question nothing was declared at Nice.|| And since that time, even those who maintained the tenet have forborne insisting on the term.¶ Why make a difference on either of these points a ground for separation? Show that any council or ecclesiastical writer, before this discussion, arose, enforced these as articles of saving belief." Let us ascend still higher, to the first general council:—"Why force our consciences by obtruding on them a profession of faith? Whence this new term consubstantial? not found in the Scriptures. How much more simple and agreeable to the comprehensive scheme of the Gospel, that short confession which was admitted by

* Perceval, 28.

† Labbe iii. 597, &c.

‡ Cyril. Alex. (ad Dynatum. Labbe iii. 1157.) It was only upon compliance with this demand that John and his associates were admitted to communion.

§ Labbe iv. 620, seq.

|| See Basil, Ep. 140. T. iii. 283, Ed. Garn.

¶ Naz. Or. xx. (on his friend St. Basil) p. 364, seq. Coloniz, 1680.

Philip the deacon as sufficient in the case of the Eunuch, (Acts viii. 37) or that which the inspired Paul (Rom. x. 9) has declared to be saving. Look, moreover, at the venerable Fathers who have preceded us with the sign of faith. Spare them at least. But you cannot proscribe *us* without an implied censure on them. Why should we be forbidden to repeat what they have uttered: why should we be constrained to profess what they were not obliged to?"

This is a counterpart to Mr. Perceval's argument against the later Church councils. We have only omitted the railing and the offensive imputations, with which it is just as easy and as fair to assail the early as the more recent synods. In *this* particular we abstain from copying him. As to the argument, (so to call it) the answer is readily furnished by St. Austin:—"Till the Arians raised a clamour, the Trinity was not perfectly treated of: till the Novatians made head, penance was not perfectly treated of. And thus, baptism was not perfectly treated of before the Rebaptisers from without (*foris positi*) contradicted: nor were the clear decisions on the Christian unity propounded till after the (Donatist) schism."* But the decisions of the Church, whether congregated in a synod or *dispersed*, were regarded as peremptory and infallible; those who reject them were stigmatized as heretics or schismatics. In like manner, *other* Catholic truths were propounded and insisted upon; the existence of original sin, the necessity of baptism and of preventing grace, the two-fold will of Christ. No dissent was tolerated:—the Catholic faith, ascertained by the Church's *authoritative* testimony, challenged the sincere admission of all.

On what ground will Mr. Perceval justify the Church of England's assertion of the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son, or its anathematizing, in the Anathasian creed, those who do not "faithfully and firmly" believe that tenet? How will he justify the retaining of the "interpolation" *filioque* in the Constantinopolitan creed; or the maintaining of the other creed in the Anglican Liturgy? For both he must descend some years (for the "interpolation," indeed, a century or more) from the Council of Chalcedon. Now, let him lay his hand on a text of Scripture, on a council or ecclesiastical writer of the five first centuries, declaring that those who do not "firmly and faithfully" assent to that tenet, and to *all* contained in the Athanasian creed, will no doubt perish everlastingly. "If he can do this—well; if not, and if the foregoing parallel between the exercise of authority by the Catholic Church in the early ages

* In Psalm liv. n. 2. vol. iv. p. 383.

and that in subsequent times, cannot be satisfactorily contradicted, the second part of his challenge is answered."

The Church of England, as we have seen, decrees the penalty of excommunication against any one guilty of the "wicked error" of affirming any of her articles to be erroneous. Her *non-exercise* of the authority thus asserted does not affect the question at issue here. She *asserts* it. Now, it would avail nothing for the excommunicated party to pretend that he had not separated from her communion: that she exacts unwarrantable terms of communion, and so forth. The ejected ministers at the Restoration were not allowed the benefit of a plea like this; and what is pronounced of an individual is (in the present case) applicable to any number or class. Commit the "wicked error" of affirming that any clause of the Thirty-nine Articles is erroneous, and excommunication ensues. The sentence need not be awaited: you are already out of the Church's pale, and can re-enter only after *repentance*. Now, in the sixteenth century, the new modellers of doctrine, varying and conflicting with themselves, were in contradiction with the defined and received tenets of that Church in which they had been baptized, whose authority they had professed to obey, in whose worship they had long participated. Their opposition was sufficient to cut them off from that Church: no sentence of excommunication was required: "they were subverted, being, condemned by their own judgment." For, "a man may not only passively and involuntarily be rejected, but also may, by an act of his own, cast out or reject himself, not only by plain and complete apostacy, but by a defection from the unity of truth, falling into some damnable heresy; or by an active separation, deserting all who are in communion with the Catholic Church, and falling into an irrecoverable schism."*

One word, in conclusion, on Mr. Perceval's "Canonical Bishops," whose rights he pretends that our prelates invade. We say nothing on the validity of the Anglican bishops' ordination; not because we admit it, but because their being effectively consecrated, does not imply their jurisdiction. A suspended or excommunicated prelate can have no jurisdiction, even according to Anglican canon law, we presume: and excommunication is a penalty which *she* awards to "wicked error" on her articles and to other offences. The episcopal character may subsist without the episcopal office and right. We smile while we read "that the bishops in England, Scotland, and Ireland, were deprived for their adherence to the uncanonical and usurped foreign

* Pearson on the 9th Article.

jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome, which he exercised here in violation of the decrees of the Councils of Nice and Ephesus.”* We marvel that their predecessors, many of them sharp-sighted men too, did not, in the course of so many centuries, make the discovery in canon law which Elizabeth and her godly helpers were so happy as to light upon. Well, this is the ground on which Mr. Perceval justifies their deprivation. Is this the ground on which their deprivation was *resolved upon*? And, what if the decrees of Nice and Ephesus were in no way opposed to that jurisdiction which these prelates recognized? Mr. Perceval must *prove* that there was this opposition; he must prove the papal jurisdiction to have been an usurpation; he must prove that the adhesion (or rather, submission) to this usurpation, was the reason alleged for superseding these bishops. He must prove all these things. He has not yet done so. The mere fact of deprivation of the old, will not establish the rightful authority of the new. “Deprived?” Why: so was Paul of Constantinople; so was Athanasius of Alexandria. “Deprived?” By what power;—after what process? A summary decision of the *secular* government! Will he favour us with some canons of Ephesus, or Nice, or Chalcedon, which warrant this procedure? A council, a hearing, a canonical sentence, justified by Church-law and precedent: these were required on the occasion. Instead of which—“*Dux femina facti.*” Surely, if “appointments to *vacant* sees are to be made at the advice of the metropolitan and bishops of the province;”—if this be “according to the rules of the Catholic Church;† the rules of the Catholic Church were, indeed, flagitiously violated in the summary and wholesale expulsion of prelates from their sees—metropolitan‡ and suffragans alike—by the arm of secular power. To borrow Mr. P.’s words, “it cannot be shown that the Church consented to these things,”—the case is, therefore, strengthened against the infringers of the canons. The bishops were, then, illegally deprived. There was consequently no vacancy in their sees, and Mr. Perceval may now read his Antiochene and Chalcedonian canons, to pronounce sentence on those who took the benefit of the extrusion of the rightful possessors, those creatures of a court who “went into cities and districts not pertaining to them, and ordained or appointed presbyters or deacons to places subject to other bishops without their consent;”§—so much for their ingress into the fold: “not entering in at the door, but climbing up some other way, To them the porter opened *not.*”

* P. 31.

† P. 66.

‡ Heath, Archbishop of York.

§ P. 31, 39.

Much more might be added: but we hasten to a close. • We dismiss without a word of comment the assertion that the bishops of *Scotland* were deprived, in the sixteenth century, for their adherence to an uncanonical and foreign jurisdiction: but we must ask where did he learn that the bishops of *Ireland* “can trace no descent, nor pretend to be descended from the ancient churches” [bishops] therein. We know well that the prelates of our national and orthodox Church were expelled and sent adrift: but we know also that they continued their apostolic functions, and that the chain of our hierarchy remains unbroken. The succession is clearly traceable. If Dr. Crolly style himself Archbishop of Armagh, (or, *in* Armagh, as the act of Emancipation will not tolerate the other designation) it is because he claims descent from St. Patrick: Dr. Murray regards himself as the successor of St. Lawrence, whose virtues and titles he has equally inherited. To any one who, like Dr. Philpotts, might charge them with usurping the titles belonging to the bishops of the Establishment, they might return the answer of the eloquent Archbishop M'Hale:—“Usurp *your* titles! It is not yours that we *usurp*, it is *OUR OWN* that we *perpetuate*.”

Before Mr. Perceval ventures again to tilt at bishops “who derive their orders from Italy,”* let him reperuse page 143 of his former work.—“It is certain and undeniable that the whole Saxon heptarchy was heathen, when the Bishop of Rome sent over St. Augustine to instruct us in the *true faith*. Our relation to her,” (the Church of Rome) “is, therefore, one degree higher than it has been hitherto stated; she is not only our sister Church, but may in some sense be styled *our mother*: and though this cannot and should not prevent our seeing her errors and avoiding them, it should at least entitle her to *kindness, affection, and respect*, at our hands, whatever her conduct to us may have been.” Mr. Perceval's *respect* for the vicars of this “*mother Church*,” this Church “to which, under God, Englishmen owe their Christian life,”† Mr. Perceval's *respect*, we say, is shown by describing them as inexcusable schismatics. As to his *kindness and affection*, the reader must be hard, indeed, to satisfy, if he is not convinced by the tokens these pages have furnished. Verily the Rector of Horseley has given us a felicitous illustration of “a new way to pay old debts.”

We have done. When Mr. P. next comes before the public, he will, it is to be hoped, be more cautious as to his positions; more temperate in his language; more candid, honest, and

* P. 23.

† Ubi supra.

even-handed in the use of his authorities; more just and equitable towards those whom he takes upon himself to impugn. He may be assured that professions of charity and zeal for the truth—contradicted by the whole strain and tenour of a book—pass for nothing with intelligent readers; that such “persons (we use his own words*)” “may be forgiven if they think that there is *something else* besides the difference in religion which excites this fierce and deadly hatred;” and finally, that insult and misrepresentation, come from what quarter they will, have to expect a just repulse and ignominious exposure.

ART. X.—1. *Animal and Vegetable Physiology, considered with reference to Natural Theology.* By Dr. Roget.

2. *Letters on Natural Magic.* By Sir David Brewster.

THE erroneous testimony which our senses frequently render, is demonstrated by numberless proofs, deducible from every-day experience, as well as from the various researches of the learned in philosophy and the natural sciences. This assertion will be sufficiently illustrated by the following references to some of the many recent works, which might, if necessary, be noticed in attestation of it.

THE IMAGINARY ISLAND OF ST. BRANDAN.†—One of the most singular geographical illusions on record, is that which for a long time haunted the imagination of the inhabitants of the Canaries. They fancied they saw a mountainous island, of about ninety leagues in length, lying far to the westward. It was seen only at intervals, though in perfectly clear and serene weather. To some it seemed one hundred leagues distant, to others forty, to others only fifteen or eighteen.‡

On attempting to reach it, however, it somehow or other eluded the search, and was nowhere to be found. Still there were so many persons of credibility who concurred in testifying to their having seen it, and the testimony of the inhabitants of different islands agreed so well as to its form and position, that its existence was generally believed; and geographers inserted it in their maps. It is laid down on the globe of Martin Behem, projected in 1492, as delineated by M. de Murr, and it will be

* Peace Offering, 123.

† See Life of Columbus, by Washington Irving, vol. iv. pp. 317, &c.

‡ Teyjoo, Teatro Critico, tom. iv. d. 10, sect. 29.

found in most of the maps of the time of Columbus, placed commonly about two hundred leagues west of the Canaries. During the time that Columbus was making his proposition to the court of Portugal, an inhabitant of the Canaries applied to King John II for a vessel to go in search of this island.*

Some have maintained that this island was known to the ancients, and was the same mentioned by Ptolemy, among the Fortunate, or Canary Islands, by the name of Aprositus,† a Greek word, signifying inaccessible; and which, according to Friar Diego Philipo, in his book on the incarnation of Christ, shows that it possessed the same quality in ancient times, of deluding the eye, and being unattainable to the feet of mortals.‡ But whatever belief the ancients may have had on the subject, it is certain that it took a strong hold on the faith of the moderns during the prevalent rage for discovery; nor did it lack abundant testimonials. Don Joseph de Viera y Clavijo says, there never was a more difficult paradox or problem in the science of geography; since to affirm the existence of this island is to trample upon sound criticism, judgment, and reason; and to deny it, one must abandon tradition and experience, and suppose that many persons of credit, had not the proper use of their senses.§

The belief in this island has continued long since the time of Columbus. It was repeatedly seen, and by various persons at a time, always in the same place, and in the same form. In 1526, an expedition set off for the Canaries in quest of it, commanded by Fernando de Troya and Fernando Alvarez. They cruised in the wonted direction, but in vain; and their failure ought to have undeceived the public. "The phantasm of the island, however," says Viera, "had such a secret enchantment for all who beheld it, that the public preferred doubting the good conduct of the explorers rather than their own senses." In 1570, the appearances were so repeated and clear, that there was a universal fever of curiosity awakened among the people of the Canaries, and it was determined to send forth another expedition. That they might not appear to act on light grounds an exact investigation was previously made, of all the persons of talent and credibility who had seen these apparitions of land, or who had other proofs of its existence.

* The name of St. Brandan, or Borondon, given to this imaginary island from time immemorial, is said to be derived from a Scotch abbot, who flourished in the sixth century, and who is called sometimes by the foregoing appellations, sometimes St. Blandano or St. Blandanus.

† Ptolemy, l. iv. c. iv.

‡ Fr. D. Philipo, lib. viii. fol. 25.

§ Hist. Isl. Can. l. i. c. xxviii.

Alonso de Espinosa, governor of the Island of Ferro, accordingly made a report, in which more than one hundred witnesses, several of them persons of the highest respectability, deposed that they had beheld the unknown island about forty leagues to the north-west of Ferro; that they had contemplated it with calmness and certainty, and had seen the sun set behind one of its points.

The mass of testimony collected by official authority in 1570 seemed so satisfactory, that another expedition was fitted out in the same year, in the Island of Palma. It was commanded by Fernando de Villalobos, regidor of the island; but was equally fruitless with the preceding. St. Borondon seemed disposed only to tantalize the world with distant and serene glimpses of his ideal paradise, or to reveal it amidst storms to tempest-tost mariners; but to hide it completely from the view of all who diligently sought it. Still the people of Palma adhered to their favourite chimera. Thirty-four years afterwards, in 1605, they sent another ship on the quest, commanded by Gaspar Perez de Acosta, an accomplished pilot, accompanied by the Padre Lorenzo Pinedo, a holy Franciscan friar, skilled in natural science. San Borondon, however, refused to reveal his island to either monk or mariner. After cruising about in every direction, sounding, observing the skies, the clouds, the winds, every thing that could furnish indications, they returned without having seen anything to authorize a hope.

Upwards of a century now elapsed without any new attempt to seek this fairy island. Every now and then, it is true, the public mind was agitated by fresh reports of its having been seen. Lemons, and other fruits, and the green branches of trees, which floated to the shores of Gomara and Ferro, were pronounced to be from the enchanted groves of San Borondon. At length, in 1721, the public infatuation again rose to such a height, that a fourth expedition was sent, commanded by Don Gaspar Dominguez, a man of probity and talent. As this was an expedition of solemn and mysterious import, he had two holy friars as apostolical chaplains. They made sail from the Island of Teneriffe towards the end of October, leaving the populace in an indescribable state of anxious curiosity. The ship, however, returned from its cruise as unsuccessful as all its predecessors.

We have no account of any expedition being since undertaken, though the island still continued to be a subject of speculation, and occasionally to reveal its shadowy mountains to the eyes of favoured individuals. In a letter, written from the Island of Gomera in 1759, by a Franciscan monk to one of his friends, he relates having seen it from the village of Alaxero, at six in

the morning of the 3rd of May. It appeared to consist of two lofty mountains, with a deep valley between, and, on contemplating it with a telescope, the valley or ravine appeared to be filled with trees. He summoned the curate, Antonio Joseph Manrique, and upwards of forty other persons, all of whom beheld it plainly.*

Nor is this island delineated merely in ancient maps of the time of Columbus. It is laid down as one of the Canary Islands in a French map published in 1704; and Mons. Gautier, in a geographical chart annexed to his "Observations on Natural History," published in 1755, places it five degrees to the west of the Island of Ferro, in the 29th degree of north latitude.†

Such are the principal facts existing relative to the island of St. Brandan. Its reality was for a long time a matter of firm belief. It was in vain that repeated voyages and investigations proved its non-existence: the public, after trying all kinds of sophistry, took refuge in the supernatural, to defend their favourite chimera. They maintained that it was rendered inaccessible to mortals by Divine Providence, or by diabolical magic. Most inclined to the former. All kinds of extravagant fancies were indulged concerning it.‡. Some confounded it with the fabled island of the Seven Cities, situated somewhere in the bosom of the ocean, where, in old times, seven bishops and their followers had taken refuge from the Moors. Some of the Portuguese imagined it to be the abode of their lost king, Sebastian. The Spaniards pretended that Roderick, the last of their Gothic kings, had fled thither from the Moors, after the disastrous battle of the Gaudalete. Others suggested that it might be the seat of the terrestrial paradise; the place where Enoch and Elijah remained in a state of blessedness until the final day; and that it was made at times apparent to the eyes, but invisible to the search of mortals. Poetry, it is said, has owed to this popular belief one of its beautiful fictions; and the Garden of Armida, where Rinaldo was detained enchanted, and which Tasso places in one of the Canary Islands, has been identified with the imaginary San Borondop.§

The learned father Feyjoo|| has given a philosophical solution to this geographical problem. He attributes all these appearances, which have been so numerous and so well authenticated as not to admit of doubt, to certain atmospherical deceptions, like that of the *fata morgana*, seen at times in the Straits of Messina, where the city of Reggio and its surrounding country

* Viers, Hist. Isl. Can. t. i. c. 28. † Ibid. ‡ Ibid. ubi sup. § Ibid.
|| Theatro Critico. t. iv. d. 10.

is reflected in the air above the neighbouring sea; a phenomenon which has likewise been witnessed in front of the city of Marseilles.

As the populace, however, reluctantly give up anything that partakes of the marvellous and mysterious, and as the same atmospheric phenomena which first gave birth to the illusion may still continue, it is not improbable that a belief in the Island of St. Brandan may still exist among the ignorant and credulous of the Canaries, and that they at times behold its fairy mountains rising above the distant horizon of the Atlantic.

THE MIRAGE.—In describing his journey across the desert to Rosetta, Dr. Clarké observes:—

“The Arabs, uttering their harsh guttural language, ran chattering by the sides of our asses; until some of them calling out ‘*Raschdid*!’ we perceived its domes and turrets, apparently upon the opposite side of an immense lake or sea, that covered all the intervening space between us and the city. Not having at the time any doubt as to the certainty of its being water, and seeing the tall minarets and buildings of Rosetta, with all its groves of dates and sycamores, as perfectly reflected by it as by a mirror, insomuch that even the minutest detail of the architecture and of the trees might have been thence delineated, we applied to the Arabs to be informed in what manner we were to pass the water. Our interpreter, although a Greek, and therefore likely to have been informed of such a phenomenon, was as fully convinced as any of us that we were drawing near the water’s edge, and became indignant when the Arabs maintained that, within an hour, we should reach Rosetta, by crossing the sands in the direct line we then pursued, and that there was no water. ‘What!’ said he, giving way to his impatience, ‘do you suppose me an idiot, to be persuaded contrary to the evidence of my senses?’ The Arabs, smiling, soon pacified him, and completely astonished the whole party, by desiring us to look back at the desert we had already passed, where we beheld a similar appearance. It was, in fact, the Mirage;* a prodigy to which

* An explanation of the phenomenon called *Mirage* by the French, was published at Cairo, in the *Décade Egyptienne*, vol. i. p. 39, by Monge: it is too long for insertion here: but the author thus previously describes the illusion:—

“Le soir et le matin, l’aspect du terrain est tel qu’il doit être; et entre vous et les derniers villages qui s’offrent à votre vue, vous n’apercevez que la terre; mais dès que la surface du sol est suffisamment échauffée par la présence du soleil, jusqu’à ce que vers le soir elle commence à se refroidir, le terrain ne paraît plus avoir la même extension, et il paraît terminé à une lieue environ par une inondation générale. Les villages qui sont placés au-delà de cette distance paraissent comme des îles situées au milieu d’un grand lac, et dont on serait séparé par un étendue d’eau plus ou moins considérable. Sous chacun des villages on voit son image renversée, telle qu’on la verrait effectivement s’il y avait en avant une surface d’eau réfléchissante.”

To this Monge adds, that the large masses only are distinctly reflected; but when the Mirage is very perfect, the most minute detail, whether of trees or buildings, may be plainly perceived, trembling as when the inverted images of objects appear in water, the surface whereof is agitated by wind.

every one of us were then strangers, although it afterwards became more familiar. Yet upon no subsequent occasion did we ever behold this extraordinary illusion so marvellously displayed. The view of it afforded us ideas of the horrible despondency to which travellers must sometimes be exposed, who, in traversing the interminable desert, destitute of water, and perishing with thirst, have sometimes this deceitful prospect before their eyes."—*Clarke's Travels*, vol. iii. p. 369.

The author of a most useful and deservedly popular work has sketched with a graphic pen the same optical delusion.*

The phenomenon of the *Mirage* excites in the pilgrim of the deserts those alternations of hope and disappointment, which add to the miseries of his actual situation. He sees before him lakes of water, which are gone the instant he arrives at the spot where he fancied they offered their refreshment to his feverish lips. The Arabs are familiar with this remarkable appearance, and they are seldom deceived by it; although, if the *Mirage* and a real stream could be seen at the same time, it would be difficult to distinguish the reality from the delusion.† The guides of the European traveller often amuse themselves by calling to him that water is in sight, when they are upon the most thirsty spots of a sandy or gravelly plain. Burckhardt has described the *Mirage* with his usual felicity:—

"During the whole day's march we were surrounded on all sides by lakes of mirage, called by the Arabs, Serab. Its colour was of the purest azure, and so clear that the shadows of the mountains which bordered the horizon were reflected in it with the greatest precision, and the delusion of its being a sheet of water was thus rendered still more perfect. I had often seen the *Mirage* in Syria and Egypt, but always found it of a whitish colour, rather resembling a morning mist, seldom lying steady on the plain, but in continual vibration; but here it was very different, and had the most perfect resemblance to water. The appearance of water approached also much nearer than in Syria and Egypt, being often not more than two hundred paces from us, whereas I had never seen it before at a distance of less than half a mile. There were at one time about a dozen of these false lakes around us, each separated from the other, and for the most part in the low grounds."‡

The *Mirage* is caused by the extraordinary refraction which the rays of the sun undergo, in passing through masses of air in contact with a surface greatly heated. These atmospheric delusions are not confined to the appearance of water in the desert. The traveller, fainting beneath a burning sun, sees a tree in the distance, sufficiently large for him to find a shade beneath its

* "The Library of Entertaining Knowledge."—The *Menageries*, vol. i. pp. 296, &c.

† Lyon, p. 347.

‡ Nubia, p. 193.

boughs. He quickens his pace, hoping to enjoy half an hour of refreshing coolness, before his camels shall have passed. The tree is really a miserable shrub, that does not afford shade enough to shelter one of his hands. This magnifying of objects is produced by the slight vapour which rises when the heat is greatest. When the sun gleams on the sand-hills, they appear at an immense distance; the traveller hopes that his camels may be spared the pain of crossing these slippery ascents,—when in a few minutes he is close upon them, and sees a man or a camel, within a stone's throw, toiling to the top.* As the sun ascends towards the zenith, and the earth and the currents of air assume different temperatures, the phenomenon of the Mirage presents numerous modifications. Humboldt states, that in the plains of South America, where the air is very dry, he often saw the images of troops of wild oxen, suspended in the air, long before the eye could see the oxen themselves; and the small currents of air were of such a variable temperature, that the legs of some appeared to rest on the ground, while others were elevated above it. In Arabia, Niebuhr observed the image of an animal reversed, before he saw the direct image. Sometimes towers, and large masses of apparent buildings, are seen upon the horizon, which disappear at intervals, without the traveller being able to decide upon the true forms of the objects, which are probably little sand-hills, beyond the ordinary range of vision.† All these phenomena are modifications of the Mirage, though the name is generally applied to the unreal lakes of the desert. The Persian and Arabian poets make frequent allusions to these magical effects of terrestrial refraction.

The same phenomenon of the Mirage is observed in Persia, where it is denominated the *Seraub*. The following extract from a little work, entitled “Uncle Oliver's Travels—*Persia*,” refers to this optical illusion:—

“We must not leave the deserts without considering that very remarkable appearance which is so frequently observed in them, and which in the east is called the *Seraub*, a word which means ‘the water of the desert.’ It is, however, not really water, but the appearance of water. As it is seen most generally in the hot deserts, where there is really no water, and where water would be the greatest of blessings, there can hardly be a more distressing illusion than this. Only suppose a man riding in the desert, where he has not seen any water for a long time, and is, perhaps, in such an agony of thirst, that he would willingly give his right arm for a cup of cold water. Think how delighted he must be to see a fine lake of water spread out before him. Oh, with what joy and desire he hastens to quench his raging

* See Lyon, p. 347.

† Humboldt's Voyages, liv. vi. chap. 17.

thirst, and cool his parched skin! But, as he comes to it, it goes from him. He cannot overtake it; and, at last it vanishes away, and sometimes appears again at a distance beyond; or, if he looks behind him, he may see that he has passed through what always seemed before him until he had passed it. It was but a vapour lying on the ground; and when the poor traveller finds this out, he becomes a thousand times more thirsty than before, from mere disappointment."

Discussing the principles on which physical science relies for its successful prosecution, Sir J. Herschel, in his admirable "Preliminary Discourse on the Study of Natural Philosophy," passes the following remarks:—

"It is necessary to distinguish between two kinds of prejudices, which exercise very different dominion over the mind. They are prejudices of opinion and prejudices of sense.—(p. 80.) Our resistance against the destruction of the other class of prejudices, those of sense, is commonly more violent at first, but less persistent, than in the case of those of opinion. Not to trust the evidence of our senses, seems, indeed, a hard condition, and one which, if proposed, none would comply with. But it is not the direct evidence of our senses that we are in any case called upon to reject, but only the erroneous judgments we unconsciously form from them, and this only when they can be shown to be so *by counter evidence of some sort*; when one sense is brought to testify against another, for instance; or the same sense against itself, and the obvious conclusions in the two cases disagree, so as to compel us to acknowledge that one or other must be wrong. For example, nothing at first can seem a more rational, obvious, and uncontrovertible conclusion, than that the *colour* of an object is an inherent quality, like its weight, hardness, &c., and that to *see* the object, and see it of *its own colour*, when nothing intervenes between our eyes and it, are one and the same thing. But this is only a prejudice; and that it is so, is shown by bringing forward the same sense of vision which led to its adoption, as evidence on the other side; for when the differently coloured prismatic rays are thrown, in a dark room, in succession upon any object, whatever be the colour we are in the habit of calling its own, it will appear of the particular hue of the light which falls upon it; a yellow paper, for instance, will appear scarlet when illuminated by red rays, yellow when by yellow, green by green, and blue by blue rays; its own (so called) proper colour *not in the least degree mixing with that it so exhibits.*"

"To give one or two more examples of the kind of illusion which the senses practise on us, or rather which we practise on ourselves, by misinterpretation of their evidence; the moon, at its rising and setting, appears much larger than when high up in the sky. This is, however, a mere erroneous judgment; for when we come to measure its diameter, so far from finding our conclusion borne out by fact, we actually find it to measure materially less. Here is eyesight opposed to eyesight, with the advantage of deliberate measurement. In ventriloquism we have the hearing at variance with the other senses, and

especially with the sight, which is sometimes contradicted by it in a very extraordinary and surprising manner, as when the voice is made to seem to issue from an inanimate and motionless object. If we plunge our hands, one into ice-cold water, and the other into water as hot as can be borne, and after letting them stay awhile, suddenly transfer them both to a vessel full of water at a blood-heat, the one will feel a sensation of heat, the other of cold. And if we cross the two first fingers of one hand, and place a pea in the fork between them, moving and rolling it about on a table, we shall (especially if we close our eyes) be fully persuaded we have two peas. If the nose be held while we are eating cinnamon, we shall perceive no difference between its flavour and that of a deal shaving."—*Preliminary Discourse on the Study of Natural Philosophy*, by Sir J. Herschel, p. 83.

Dr. Chandler, on noting down his entry into the Mediterranean, gives the following description of the setting of the sun:—

"The sun, before its setting, was exceedingly big, and assumed a variety of fantastic shapes. It was surrounded at first with a golden glory, of great extent, and glanced above the surface of the sea in a long column of fire. The lower half of the orb soon after immersed in the horizon, the other portion remaining very large and red, with half of a smaller orb beneath it, and separate, but in the same direction, the circular line approaching the line of its diameter. These two, by degrees, united, and then changed rapidly into different figures, until the resemblance was that of a capacious punch-bowl inverted. The rim of the bottom extending upward, and the body lengthening below, it became a mushroom on a stalk with a round head. It was next metamorphosed into a flaming cauldron, of which the lid, rising up, swelled nearly into an orb, and vanished. The other portions put on several uncircular forms, and after many twinklings and faint glimmerings, slowly disappeared, quite red."*

REMARKABLE OPTICAL ILLUSION.—"An ocular delusion occurred to myself," says Sir David Brewster, "of so extraordinary a nature, that I am convinced it never was seen before, and I think it far from probable that it will be ever seen again. Upon directing my eyes to the candles that were standing before me, I was surprised to observe, apparently among my hair and nearly straight above my head, and far without the range of vision, a distinct image of one of the candles, inclined about 45° to the horizon. The image was as distinct and perfect as if it had been formed by reflection from a piece of mirror glass, though of course much less brilliant, and the position of the image proved that it must be formed by reflection from a perfectly flat and highly polished surface. But where such a surface could be placed, and how, even if it were fixed,

* "Chandler's Travels in Asia Minor," p. 3. In talking of the Bridge of Ronda, Jacob, in his "Travels in the South of Spain," p. 234, observes, "When standing on the bridge, the optical delusion is very singular; the torrent of water appears to run up a hill towards the bridge, and the same phenomenon takes place when viewed in either direction."

it could reflect the image of the candle up through my head, were difficulties not a little perplexing. Thinking that it might be something lodged in the eyebrow, I covered it up from the light, but the image still retained its place. I then examined the eyelashes with as little success, and was driven to the extreme supposition that a chrystallization was taking place in some part of the aqueous humour of the eye, and that the image was formed by the reflection of the light of the candle from one of the chrystalline faces. In this state of uncertainty, and, I may add, of anxiety, for this last supposition was by no means an agreeable one, I set myself down to examine the phenomenon experimentally. I found that the image varied its place by the motion of the head and of the eyeball, or occupied a place where it was affected by that motion. Upon inclining the candle at different angles, the image suffered corresponding variations of position. In order to determine the exact place of the reflecting substance, I now took an opaque circular body, and held it between the eye and the candle, till it eclipsed the mysterious image. By bringing the body nearer and nearer the eyeball till its shadow being sufficiently distinct to be seen, it was easy to determine the locality of the reflector, because the shadow of the opaque body must fall upon it whenever the image of the candle was eclipsed. In this way I ascertained that the reflecting body was in the upper eyelash, and I found, that in consequence of being disturbed, it had twice changed its inclination, so as to represent a vertical candle in a horizontal position, and afterwards in an inverted position. Still, however, I sought for it in vain, and even with the aid of a magnifier, I could not discover it. At last, however, Mrs. B., who possesses the perfect vision of short-sighted persons, discovered, after repeated examinations between two eyelashes, a minute speck, which, upon being removed with great difficulty, turned out to be a chip of red wax not above the hundredth part of an inch in diameter, and having its surface so perfectly flat and so highly polished, that I could see in it the same image of the candle, by placing it extremely near the eye. This chip of wax had no doubt received its flatness and its polish from the surface of a seal, and had started into my eye when breaking the seal of a letter.*

Can anything be more deceptive to the eyes than the imposition practised on that organ by a mass of ice-land or double refracting spar, and by several other refracting substances? Of these, many have tortured the philosopher's ingenuity for a plausible solution. If a slip of paper, on which a sentence, or a line, or any figure, is traced, be held behind the spar of a cubic form, the paper will exhibit the same sentence or figure twice, as if it were twice written or figured with it. A pyramidal crystal of transparent quartz, may be held in such a position, that if the head of the pin be placed against the underside of the prism, it will be visible on three planes of the prism, and on

* "Natural Magic," p. 32.

three of the pyramid, at the same time. The two images of a circle, described with a pen upon paper; may be made nearly to coincide, by holding a rhomb of calcareous spar in a particular direction, and they may be made almost to separate by another position. The cause of the phenomenon of double refraction is not understood, farther than that it is in consequence of peculiar transmission of the rays of light, owing, as it is conjectured, to the construction of the mineral.*

Many membranous shells exhibit, on several parts of their internal surface, a glistening, silvery, or iridescent appearance. This appearance is caused by the peculiar thinness, transparency, and regularity of arrangement of the outer layers of the membrane, which, in conjunction with the particles of carbonate of lime, enter into the formation of that part of the surface of the shell. The surface which has thus acquired a pearly lustre, was formerly believed to be a peculiar substance, which was dignified with the appellation of *mother of pearl*, from the notion that was entertained of it being the material of which pearls were formed. It is true, indeed, that pearls are actually composed of the same materials, and have the same laminated structure, as the membranous shells; being formed by very thin concentric plates of membrane and carbonate of lime, disposed alternately, and often surrounding a central body: but Sir David Brewster has satisfactorily shown, that the iridescent colours exhibited by these surfaces, are wholly the effect of the parallel grooves consequent upon the regularity of arrangement of shells.†

MOTIONS OF THE EYES IN PORTRAITS.—A series of curious, and sometimes alarming, deceptions, arises from the representations of objects in perspective, upon a plane surface. One of the most interesting of these depends on the principles which regulate the apparent direction of the eyes in a portrait. When we look at any person, we direct to them both our face and our eyes, and in this position the circular iris will be in the middle of the white of the eyeball, or, what is the same thing, there will be the same quantity of white on each side of the iris. If the eyes are now moved to either side, while the head remains fixed, we shall readily judge of the change of their direction by the greater or less quantity of white on each side of the iris. This test, however, accurate as it is, enables us only to estimate the extent to which the eyes deviate in direction from the direction of the face to which they belong. But their direction, in reference to the person who views them, is entirely a different matter; and Dr. Wollaston is of opinion, that we are not guided

* Phillip's "Mineralogy," p. xxxvi.

† "Animal and Vegetable Physiology," by Roget, vol. i. p. 231.

by the eyes alone, but are unconsciously aided by the concurrent position of the entire face.

If a skilful painter draws a pair of eyes with great correctness directed to the spectator, and deviating from the general position of the face, as much as is usual in good portraits, it is very difficult to determine their direction, and they will appear to have different directions to different persons. But what is very curious, Dr. Wollaston has shown that the same pair of eyes may be made to direct themselves either to or from the spectator, by the addition of other features in which the position of the face is changed.

It is a well-known fact, that when the eyes of a portrait look at a spectator in front of it, they will follow him, and appear to look at him in every other direction. This curious fact, which has received less consideration than it merits, has been often skilfully employed by the novelist, in alarming the fears or exciting the courage of his hero. On returning to the hall of his ancestors, his attention is powerfully fixed on the grim portraits which surround him. The parts which they have respectively performed in the family history rise to his mind: his own actions, whether good or evil, are called up in contrast, and as the preserver or the destroyer of his line, he stands, as it were, in judgment before them. His imagination, thus excited by conflicting feelings, transfers a sort of vitality to the canvas, and if the personages do not "start from their frames," they will at least bend upon him their frowns or their approbation. It is in vain that he tries to evade their scrutiny. Wherever he goes, their eyes eagerly pursue him;—they will seem even to look at him over their shoulders, and he will find it impossible to shun their gaze but by quitting the apartment.†

AERIAL SPECTRES IN CUMBERLAND.—One of the most interesting accounts of aerial spectres with which we are acquainted, has been given by Mr. James Clarke, in his survey of the lakes of Cumberland, and the accuracy of this account was confirmed by the attestations of two of the persons, by whom the phenomena were first seen. On a summer's evening, in the year 1743, when Daniel Stricket, servant to John Wren of Wilton Hall, was sitting at the door along with his master, he saw the figure of a man with a dog pursuing some horses along Souterfell side, a place so extremely steep that a horse could scarcely travel upon it at all. The figures appeared to run at an amazing pace, till they got out of sight at the lower end of the fell. On the following morning, Stricket and his master ascended the

† "Natural Magic," p. 118.

steep side of the mountain, in the full expectation of finding the man dead, and of picking up some of the shoes of the horses, which they thought must have been cast while galloping at such a furious rate. Their expectations, however, were disappointed, no traces either of man or horse could be found, and they could not even discover upon the turf the single mark of a horse's hoof. These strange appearances, seen at the same time by two different persons in perfect health, could not fail to make a deep impression on their minds. They at first concealed what they had seen, but they at length disclosed it, and were laughed at for their credulity.

In the following year, on the 23rd of June, 1744, Daniel Stricket, who was then servant to Mr. Lancaster of Blakehills, (a place near Wilton Hall, and both of which places are only about half a mile from Souterfell) was walking, about seven o'clock in the evening, a little above the house, when he saw a troop of horsemen riding on Souterfell side, in pretty close ranks, and at a brisk pace. Recollecting the ridicule that had been cast upon him the preceding year, he continued to observe the figures for some time in silence; but being at last convinced that there could be no deception in the matter, he went to the house and informed his master that he had something curious to show him. They accordingly went out together; but before Stricket had pointed out the place, Mr. Lancaster's son had discovered the aerial figures. The family was then summoned to the spot, and the phenomena were seen alike by them all. The equestrian figures seemed to come from the lowest parts of Souterfell, and became visible at a place called Knott. They then advanced in regular troops along the side of the fell, till they came opposite to Blakehills, when they went over the mountain, after describing a kind of curvilinear path. The pace at which the figures moved, was a regular swift walk, and they continued to be seen for upwards of two hours, the approach of darkness alone preventing them from being visible. Many troops were seen in succession; and frequently the last but one in a troop quitted his position, galloped to the front, and took up the same pace as the rest. The changes in the figures were seen equally by all the spectators, and the view of them was not confined to the farm of Blakehills only, but they were to be seen by every person at every cottage within the distance of a mile, the number of persons who saw them amounting to about twenty-six. The attestation of these facts, signed by Lancaster and Stricket, bears the date of the 21st July, 1785.*

* The aerial troopers seen at Souterfell, were produced by the very same process as the spectre of Dover Castle, having been brought by unequal refraction from one

THE FATA MORGANA.—This singular exhibition has been frequently seen in the Straits of Messina, between Sicily and the coast of Italy, and whenever it takes place, the people, in a state of exultation, as if it were not only a pleasing but a lucky phenomenon, hurry down to the sea, exclaiming, "Morgana, Morgana!" When the rays of the rising sun form an angle of 45° on the sea of Reggio, and when the surface of the water is perfectly unruffled either by the wind or the current, a spectator placed upon an eminence in the city, and having his back to the sun and his face to the sea, observes upon the surface of the water superb palaces, with their balconies and windows, lofty towers, herds of flocks grazing in wooded vallies and fertile plains, armies of men on horseback and on foot, with multiplied fragments of buildings, such as columns, pilasters, and arches. These objects pass rapidly in succession along the surface of the sea during the brief period of their appearance. The various objects thus enumerated are pictures of palaces and buildings actually existing on shore, and the living objects are of course only seen when they happen to form a part of the general landscape.†

OBJECTS BELOW THE HORIZON MAGNIFIED.—In our own country, and in our own times, facts still more extraordinary have been witnessed. From Hastings, on the coast of Sussex, the cliffs on the French coast are fifty miles distant, and they are actually hid by the convexity of the earth, that is, a straight line drawn from Hastings to the French coast, would pass through the sea. On Wednesday, the 26th July, 1798, about five o'clock in the afternoon, Mr. Latham, a Fellow of the Royal Society, then residing at Hastings, was surprised to see a crowd of people running to the sea side. Upon inquiry into the cause of this, he learned that the coast of France could be seen by the naked eye, and he immediately went down to witness so singular a sight. He distinctly saw the cliffs extending for some leagues along the French coast, and they appeared as if they were only a few

side of the hill to the other. It is not our business to discover how a troop of soldiers came to be performing their evolutions on the other side of Souterfell, but if there was then no road along which they could be marching, it is highly probable that they were troops exercising among the hills in secret, previous to the breaking out of the rebellion in 1745.—"Natural Magic," p. 152.

† The phenomena of the Fata Morgana have been too imperfectly described to enable us to offer a satisfactory explanation of them. The aerial images are obviously those formed by unequal refraction. The pictures seen on the sea may be either the aerial images reflected from its surface, or from a stratum of dense vapour, or they may be the direct reflections from the objects themselves. The coloured images, as described by Minasi, have never been seen in any analogous phenomena, and require to be better described before they can be submitted to scientific examination.—"Natural Magic, pp. 155, 156.

miles off. They gradually appeared more and more elevated, and seemed to approach nearer to the eye. The sailors with whom Mr. Latham walked along the water's edge, were at first unwilling to believe in the reality of the appearance, but they soon became so convinced of it, that they pointed out and named to him the different places which they had been accustomed to visit, and which they conceived to be as near as if they were sailing at a small distance into the harbour. These appearances continued for nearly an hour; the cliffs sometimes appearing brighter and nearer, and at other times fainter and more remote. Mr. Latham then went upon the eastern cliff or hill, which is of considerable height, when, as he remarks, a most beautiful scene presented itself to his view. He beheld at once Dungeness, Dover Cliffs, and the French coast all along from Calais, Boulogne, &c. to St. Vallery, and, as some of the fishermen affirmed, as far west as Dieppe. With the help of a telescope, the French fishing boats were plainly seen at anchor, and the different colours of the land upon the heights, together with the buildings, were perfectly discernible. Mr. Latham likewise states that the cape of land called Dungeness, which extends nearly two miles into the sea, and is about sixteen miles in a straight line from Hastings, appeared as if quite close to it, and the vessels and fishing-boats which were sailing between the two places appeared equally near, and were magnified to a high degree. These curious phenomena continued "in the highest splendour" till past eight o'clock, although a black cloud had for some time totally obscured the face of the sun.

A phenomenon no less marvellous, was seen by Professor Vince, of Cambridge, and another gentleman, on the 6th of August, 1806, at Ramsgate. The summits of the four turrets of Dover Castle, are usually seen over a hill, upon which it stands, lying between Ramsgate and Dover; but on the day above-mentioned, at seven o'clock in the evening, when the air was very still and a little hazy, not only were the tops of the four turrets of Dover Castle seen over the adjacent hill, *but the whole of the castle appeared as if it were situated on the side of the hill next Ramsgate*, and rising above the hill as much as usual. This phenomenon was so very singular and unexpected, that at first sight, he thought it an illusion; but upon continuing his observations, he became satisfied that it was a real image of the castle.

This illusion derived great force, from the remarkable circumstance, that the hill itself did not appear through the image, as it might have been expected, to do. The image of the castle was very strong and well defined, and though the rays from the

hill behind it must undoubtedly have come to the eye, yet the strength of the image of the castle so far obscured the back ground, that it made no sensible impression on the observers.*

Before we take leave of the "Letters on Natural Magic," we must give expression to our unfeigned surprise, and deep regret, that their talented author should have allowed his fine mind to have been blotted with such vulgar and sectarian prejudices, as he manifests against the Catholic Church. Surely, it was quite a work of supererogation, for Sir David Brewster to travel beyond his province, and boldly assert, without exhibiting one particle of proof, that the monks and priesthood of the Catholic Church, during the middle ages, exercised what knowledge they possessed of chemistry and mechanism, to impose upon the credulity and religious feelings of the people. We put aside the duty, imperative on every Christian, of not bearing false witness against his neighbour. As an eminent patron, however, of the inductive system of philosophy, which admits of no conclusion not warranted by an accumulation of well-authenticated facts, Sir David Brewster should not have promulgated an opinion destitute of proofs, and adopted without inquiry. Has he made good his accusation, by producing one single fact? He has not; and we dare him to the trial.

It has been a favourite practice with those who controlled our national literature, to attribute to the Catholic religion, the grossest abuses, which existed no where but in their own imagination or invention; and to load the Catholic hierarchy with epithets, as unmerited as they were vituperative. Such a proceeding was, in general, dictated either by an anxiety of securing the applause of the bigot, or the interested opponent to the civil rights of British Catholics. Or, by catering to the morbid appetite for coarse attacks, which characterizes the "vulgum pecus," the common herd of ignorant readers, to secure a wider and more lucrative circulation of their productions. Sir David Brewster should have rescued his name from the possibility of being identified, in aftertimes, with a class of writers who were guided by such unhallowed and such paltry motives. While,

* Natural Magic, p. 135, &c.

The phenomenon of Dover Castle, seen on the Ramsgate side of the hill, was produced by the air being more dense near the ground, and above the sea, and at greater heights; and hence the rays proceeding from the castle reached the eye in curve lines, and the cause of its occupying its natural position on the hill, and not being seen in the air, was, that the top of the hill itself, in consequence of being so near the castle, suffered the same change from the varying density of the air; and therefore, the castle and the hill were equally elevated, and retained their relative positions. The reason why the image of the castle and the hill appeared erect, was, that the rays from the top and bottom of the castle had not crossed before they reached Ramsgate; an eye at a greater distance from the castle, and in the path of the rays, would have seen the image inverted.—*Natural Magic*, p. 154.

however, we fully appreciate the talent and the science with which Sir David Brewster has treated "Natural Magic," we call upon him distinctly, to produce one single proof for hazarding the following assertion:—

"After the establishment of Christianity, the Catholic sanctuary was often the seat of these unhallowed machinations. (Those formerly practised by pagan priests, on a systematic plan of imposing on the people). Nor was it merely the low and cunning priest, who thus sought to extort money and respect from the most ignorant of his flock. Bishops and pontiffs themselves, wielded the magician's wand over the diadem of kings and emperors; and by the pretended exhibition of supernatural power, made the mightiest potentates of Europe tremble upon their thrones!"—*Letters on Natural Magic*, p. 57.

Dr. Roget, in his *Gulstonian Lectures*, read before the Royal College of Physicians, during the month of May, 1832, selected for his subject the Laws of Sensation and Perception. From them may be extracted the following remarks, as more immediately referable to the subject under examination.

Decisive evidence of the discordance between our perceptions and their causes, is furnished by the numerous instances which show the fallacy of those perceptions, and the errors we are liable to commit, when we place in them an undue confidence. Many examples of this kind were stated, in which fallacious perceptions arise, when certain impressions are made in an unusual manner upon the nerves of sensation. In particular, the effects of the transmission of the galvanic influence through the facial nerves, giving rise to the appearance of flashes of light, when no light is really present, were minutely detailed, as well as those attending the action of galvanism upon the auditory, the olfactory, and the gustatory nerves. It has been supposed, that in the last of these instances, where a peculiar metallic taste is excited, by including the nerves of the tongue in the galvanic circuit, a considerable part, if not the whole of the effect, arises from the actual presence of saline matter, developed from the decomposition of the saliva, by the chemical influence of the galvanism; but, this mode of explaining the phenomenon is incorrect; and among the reasons for rejecting it, is, that the effect succeeds the contact of the metals too instantaneously, to warrant the supposition that chemical decomposition can have been effected to the extent required for the production of the observed effect.

The judgments we form of the colours of bodies, are influenced, in a great measure, by the vicinity of other coloured objects, which modify the general sensibility of the retina. Many illustrations were given of this principle. When a white, or grey object, of small dimensions, for instance, is viewed on a coloured

ground, it generally appears to assume a tint of the colour which is complimentary to that of the ground itself. It is the *etiquette* among the Chinese, to employ paper of a bright scarlet hue, in all their epistles of ceremony. Dr. Roget was informed by a gentleman, who was formerly resident in China, that he for a long time, believed that green ink was employed for writing on this paper; and that he was much surprised, on discovering afterwards, that the ink was really a pure black, without any tinge of colour. In this case, the green appearance of the letters was an optical deception, arising from the tendency of the retina, impressed by the vivid red colour of the paper, to assume the action naturally resulting from green light, which is complimentary to the red.

A general law of sensation is, that the impression made by an external agent on the nerve of sense, continues for a certain time, after the action of that external agent has ceased. The influence of this law can be traced in each of the different senses; for it is found to extend universally to every case which affords an opportunity for observation. In the case of tastes, or odours, but especially in that of touch, it admits of being detected only when the impressions are sufficiently powerful. Ample proof, however, is afforded of its operation in the case of sound; for the sensation of a continuous musical note, arises from the regular succession of aerial undulations; the impression made by each, continuing, during the whole period of the interval, between two consecutive vibrations.

The influence of this law of sensation, is exhibited in the most striking manner in various phenomena of vision. The appearance of an entire luminous circle from the whirling of a piece of lighted charcoal, is a familiar instance of this general fact. In like manner, a fiery meteor shooting across the sky in the night, appears to leave behind it a long luminous train. Among other illustrations, the instrument contrived by Mr. Wheatstone, and termed by him the *Kaleidophone*, may be cited. It exhibits to the eye, on the principle of the permanence of sensations, the paths described by the point of greatest excursion in vibrating rods, which often constitute the most beautiful curvilinear forms.

The deception which takes place in the apparent figure of the spokes of a carriage-wheel which is rolling along the ground, when it is viewed through the intervals of vertical parallel bars, such as those of a palisade, or of an upright Venetian blind, is an example of the operation of the same law. Instead of appearing straight, as they would naturally do if no bars intervened, the spokes seem to be considerably curved. The two spokes which happen to be in the vertical position, are seen in their

natural shape—that is, straight; but those which are obliquely situated, appear to have a degree of curviture, which is greatest in those which are farthest from the upper part of the wheel. The most curious circumstance is, that the spokes on both sides appear to be bent with their convexities downwards; and this happens equally, whether the wheel be moving to the right or to the left, of the spectator. A certain degree of velocity of revolution is necessary to produce this visual deception; but the degree of curvature in the appearance of the spokes, remains precisely the same, whatever greater velocity is given to the wheel, provided it be not so great as to prevent the eye from following the spokes distinctly as they revolve.

A still wider field of inquiry may be entered upon, in the examination of the mode in which the physical impressions made on the retina by rays of light, collected into their respective foci, so as to form upon that membrane an exact picture of the surrounding scene, give rise to visual perceptions. The solution of the questions it embraces, involves the application of the laws both of mental and physical phenomena, and is embarrassed by an unusual complication of difficulties; for, in addition to those which are the ordinary attendants upon physiological inquiries, we have here to encounter more formidable obstacles, in the perplexing subtleties of metaphysics. It requires a strong effort of mental abstraction, in order to divest ourselves of the prejudices resulting from early association, and which have become so rivetted by long habit, as to constitute a second nature, and to be regarded as a necessary part of our mental frame. A careful and patient analysis of our visual perceptions, is necessary for the discovery, that they include ideas of space, which are derived from another sense, and which vision alone would be incompetent to convey.

The effects of the movements of the body, when rapid, and performed by revolving in a circle, in inducing a state of giddiness and disturbing our perceptions of the situations of objects, were among the instances adduced of confusion in our judgments, arising from unusual circumstances in the exercise of our senses. That we fail on those occasions in applying correctly the principles of visual perception, is also shewn by the strange appearance of a distant prospect when viewed with the head inverted.

Similar fallacies occur in our judgments of the position of objects with respect to the perpendicular direction, when deprived of the ordinary mode of estimating the direction of the force of gravity.

In the judgments we form, both of the distance and of the magnitude of objects, our inferences with respect to the one are

often determined by our previous or supposed knowledge of the other. Multiplied illustrations may be offered of this general principle, in instances both of natural scenery, and of the effects of various optical contrivances—such as telescopes, microscopes, and the phantasmagoria. The illusion which takes place with regard to the comparative magnitude of the sun or moon, when at the horizon, and when considerably elevated above it, is traced to the same law; which affords also an explanation of the mistakes to which we are liable with regard to the direction of the revolution of a wheel, or the sails of a windmill, when viewed obliquely. The idea we form of the convexity or concavity of a surface from its visible appearance, is determined chiefly by the supposed direction of the light which falls upon it, and is reflected to our eyes; and any error that we may commit with regard to the latter, is immediately productive of a fallacy in our perceptions of the former. Thus, if an engraved seal be viewed through a convex lens, at such a distance as to occasion an inversion of the image, the figure will appear to the eye to be raised, instead of depressed. Similar deceptions occur in viewing objects through a compound microscope, which inverts their images. In a picture, in like manner, the very same mode of representing an object may be made to suggest either a convex or a concave surface, according as the mind is led to conceive it illuminated from the one side or the other.

The illusions of our senses may be arranged under three heads, according as they are dependent on causes of a physical, physiological, or mental kind.

The first includes those in which an impression is really made on the organ of sense by an external cause, but in a way to which we have not been accustomed, such as the acoustic deceptions arising from echoes, from the unusual conveyance of sounds, or from the arts of the ventriloquist; the optical deceptions of the looming of the horizon at sea, the mirage of the desert, the *fata morgana* of the coast, the spectre of the Brocken, the phantasmagoria, the kaleidoscope, the suspended image of concave mirrors, and the other innumerable combinations of optical laws.

The second class comprehends those in which the source of deception is more internal, and owing to the peculiar conditions of the sentient organs, such as all those adverted to in the former part of these lectures, in which impressions are made on the nerves of sense by causes different from those which usually excite them. Ocular spectra of various kinds, the impressions on the eye and the tongue from galvanism, and singing in the ears from excited circulation, are among the many perceptions

which rank under this head. This class also includes a great number of internal sensations referable to the law of sympathy, and the endless variety of perceptive hallucinations arising from disordered conditions of the sensorium.

Of the third class of fallacies, including those which are purely mental, and originate in the errors of our reasoning powers alone, many examples can be offered. To this source of error all our senses are liable; but more especially those, such as vision and hearing, in the formation of the perceptions of which association exerts the greatest influence. Even the sense of touch is liable to deceptions of this nature; as in the case of the perception of two balls, resulting from feeling a single ball with the finger's crossed.*

While noticing the fallacious testimony which is so often yielded by the senses, it will not be inappropriate to refer to their almost perpetual inadequacy, and of vision in particular, when unaided by art, to assist us in detecting the stupendous secrets of nature, and of forming just conceptions of its wonders.

"No one, unaccustomed to explore the wonders of nature, would suspect that so simple a body as the crystalline lens, or hard central part, of the eye of a cod-fish, which he might suppose to be formed of a uniform material cast in a mould, would disclose, when examined under a powerful microscope, and with the skill of a Brewster, the most refined and exquisite conformation. Yet, as I shall have occasion to specify more in detail in its proper place, this little spherical body, scarcely larger than a pea, is composed of upwards of five millions of fibres, which lock into one another by means of more than sixty-two thousand five hundred millions of teeth. If such be the complication of a portion only of the eye of that animal, how intricate must be the structure of the other parts of the same organ, having equally important offices! What exquisite elaboration must those textures have received, whose functions are still more refined! What marvellous workmanship must have been exercised in the organization of the nerves and of the brain, those subtle instruments of the higher animal faculties, and of which even the modes of action are to us not merely inscrutable, but surpassing all our powers of conception.†

"Professor Ehrenberg has proved, that there are monads not larger than the 24,000th part of an inch, and that they are so thickly crowded in the fluid, as to leave intervals not greater than their own diameter. Hence each cubic line, or a single drop of the fluid, contains five hundred millions of monads; a number equal to all the human beings

* Abstract of the Gulstonian Lectures, read to the Royal College of Physicians in May 1832, by Dr. Roget.—From the *London Medical Gazette* for June 2, 1832 p. 274, &c.

† Roget's "Animal and Vegetable Physiology," vol. i. p. 59.

on our globe.* This able naturalist has proved, that even the *monas termo* possesses *internal cavities for the reception and digestion of its food*; and has rendered it probable that they have an organization as complete as that of the larger infusoria, such as the *rotifera*, in which he has distinguished traces of a *muscular*, a *nervous*, and even a *vascular*, system.†

"In examining the nutritive and reproductive functions of the infusoria, Professor Ehrenberg has been equally successful.‡ In order to display their digestive organs, he conceived the happy idea of supplying them with coloured food, which tinged the cavities through which it passed. For this purpose, he employed a highly attenuated solution of pure indigo, and disclosed the existence of a system of digestive cavities in all the known genera of this tribe of animals. These organs exhibit great variety in their form, situation, and arrangement, and though they differ in their degree of complication, yet *this difference has no relation* to the size of the animalcules. In the *monas atomus*, the minutest of animals, there are 'a number of sacs, opening by as many separate orifices, from a circumscribed part of the surface.' The *leucophra patula* has a long alimentary canal, traversing the greater part of the body, taking several spiral turns, and furnished with from one to two hundred blind pouches or cæca, which are regarded as separate stomachs; and hence these animals, *which Lamarck and others called AGASTRICA, from their having no stomach, are actually called POLYGASTRICA by EHRENBURG, from their having more than a hundred stomachs* §. In some *vorticellæ*, one intestine, furnished with numerous cæca, makes a complete circular turn, ending where it began; and—'Thus,' says Dr. Roget, 'do we discover the same diversity in the structure of the digestive organs of the several races of these diminutive beings, as is found in the other classes of animals.'|| The same accomplished naturalist very properly remarks, that—'There is not, as far as we have the means of judging, in the colossal fabric of the elephant, any structure more complicated than exists in the minutest insect that crawls unheeded at our feet.'¶

"The grains of the farina or dust of the *Dodecatheon Meadia*, or American cowslip, when inspected with the assistance of a compound microscope, will be found to be particularly beautiful. They are distinctly organized minute pearls. So minute, that one square inch will contain of them upwards of three millions; and as squares cannot be covered by circles, more than one-fifth of the space will be left unoccupied; or to be more particular in numbers, presuming that a square inch will contain three millions of circles in direct rows each way, the area of each of such circles will be the 3,819,709th part of the area of an inch."—*Maund's Botanical Garden*, vol. j. No. 25.

"Both the different kinds of eyes which occur among insects, are to be found in the diurnal Lepidoptera. The ordinary, or compound eyes, are large and hemispherical, occupying the greater part of the head,

* Roget's "Animal and Vegetable Physiology," vol. i. p. 13.

† Ibid. vol. i. p. 186.

‡ Ibid. vol. ii. p. 93.

§ Ibid. vol. ii. p. 97.

|| Ibid. vol. ii. p. 98.

¶ Ibid. vol. i. p. 191.

and no fewer than 17,325 lenses have been counted in one of them. As each of these chrySTALLINE lenses possesses all the properties of a perfect eye, some butterflies may therefore be said, if Mr. Puget's observations are correct, to have no fewer than 34,650 !"—*The Naturalist's Library*, by Sir W. Jardine; *Entomology*, vol. iii.—*British Butterflies*, p. 60.

"The mode of painting employed to produce those rich tints observable on a butterfly's wings, may not improperly be called a kind of natural mosaic, for the colours invariably reside in the scales, which form a dense covering over the whole surface. These scales are fixed in the wing by means of a narrow pedicle, and are most commonly disposed in transverse rows placed close together, and overlapping each other like the tiles of a house. When they are rubbed off, the wing is found to consist of an elastic membrane, thin and transparent, and marked with slightly indented lines, forming a kind of groove for the insertion of the scales. The latter are so minute, that they appear to the naked eye like powder or dust, and as they are very closely placed, their numbers on a single insect are astonishingly great. Leeuwenhoeck counted upwards of 400,000 on the wings of the silk moth, an insect not above one-fourth of the size of some of our native butterflies. A modern mosaic picture may contain 870 tesserae, or separate pieces, in one square inch of surface; but the same extent of a butterfly's wing sometimes consists of no fewer than 100,736 !"—*Ibid.*, pp. 56, 57.

"The silken thread of a caterpillar is composed of two united within the tube of the spinneret; but the spider's thread would appear, from the first view of its five spinnerets, to be quintuple. On looking, however, with a strong magnifying glass, at the teat-shaped spinnerets of a spider, we perceive them to be studded with regular rows of minute bristle-like points, about a thousand to each teat, making in all from five to six thousand. These are minute tubes, which we may appropriately term spinnerules, as each is connected with the internal reservoirs, and emits a thread of inconceivable fineness."—*Insect Architecture; Library of Entertaining Knowledge*, p. 337.

"Leeuwenhoeck, in one of his extraordinary microscopical observations on a young spider, not bigger than a grain of sand, upon enumerating the threadlets on one of its threads, calculated that it would require four millions of them to be as thick as a hair of his beard."—*Ibid.* p. 339.

Talking of cellular tissue, Professor Lindley observes, "The cellules develope, in some cases, with great rapidity. I have seen *Lupinus polyphyllus* grow in length at the rate of an inch and a half a day. The leaf of *Urania speciosa* has been found by Mulder to lengthen at the rate of from one and a half to three and a half lines per hour, and even as much as from four to five inches per day. This may be computed to equal the developement of at least 4000 or 5000 cellules per hour. But the most remarkable instances of this sort are to be found in the mushroom tribe, which in all cases develope with surprising rapidity. It is stated by Junghues that he has known

the *Borista giganteum*, in damp warm weather, grow in a single night from the size of a mere point to that of a huge gourd. We are not farther informed of the dimensions of this specimen; but supposing its cellules to be no less than the $\frac{1}{16}$ of an inch in diameter, and I suspect they are nearer the $\frac{1}{32}$, it may be fairly estimated to have consisted, when full grown, of about 47,000,000,000 cellules; so that, supposing it to have grown in the course of twelve hours, its cellules must have developed at the rate of near 4,000,000,000 per hour, or of more than sixty-six millions in a minute."—*Lindley's Introduction to Botany*, p. 7.

"The leaves of the Bujoor Palm of India, (*Coryfolia elata*) often measures thirty feet in circumference, and have a stalk to support them, twelve feet long; so, that if placed on the ground, one of these enormous leaves would be four times as high as a tall man. There is no machine of human invention, however extensive and complicated, which, can for a moment, be compared with such a natural apparatus as this, for wonderfully elaborate mechanism. Its digesting cells are infinitely more numerous than all the houses in London and its environs; and all the streets, alleys, and passages of that huge metropolis, shrink into insignificance, when contrasted with the myriads of ramifications of the veins of such a leaf."—*Botany, in the Library of Useful Knowledge*, by Lindley, p. 21.

That the senses, through their fallacious natures, which is amply demonstrated by these interesting examples, are utterly incompetent and inadmissible as faithful guides in any investigation on the mysteries of religion and objects of divine faith, must be readily conceded by every reasonable and well regulated mind.

It is true that our senses, when assisted by the auxiliaries of art, and instructed by science, are made acquainted with their own illusions, and acknowledge their erroneous conclusions concerning objects connected with nature. When illuminated by divine faith, and taught by religion, the human mind becomes equally docile concerning the mysteries of belief, and persuades us to subdue our reason into an obedience to the sublime, but inexplicable truths of revelation.

Of mankind, however, very few possess the means, or are endowed with the leisure and abilities requisite to work out for themselves, and arrive at those conclusions which are necessary for the correction of erroneous judgments of the senses. The canons of science, are consequently dependent for their credibility, amongst the great body of mankind, on the good faith of a few gifted and educated individuals. The learned deductions, the useful theories, and beautiful truths, drawn from these principles of science, are in reality, taken by the world upon trust. They are believed in, upon human faith; and assented to, by millions who cannot understand them. If therefore, the ingenious conclusions of the philosopher, however startling, however

seemingly absurd, however apparently incompatible with any thing like possibility, are, without hesitation, admitted by the unlettered, as well as by the studious and illuminated portion of mankind, it seems passing strange—a lamentable display of human weakness—for those individuals who are so ready of belief in matters enveloped in the obscurity of nature only, stand forward so obstinately incredulous about matters of faith, which must cease to be such, the moment they are understood—to become so restive in yielding their assent to truths, belonging to an infinitely higher order of mysteries—those of revealed religion; and to avow the legitimacy of rejecting an article of Christianity, because the human understanding, in its present gross and unenlightened mode of existence, cannot with facility explain it. Inexplicable as this inconsistency must always appear, it is however, mournfully exhibited in the conduct of many, whose separation from the Catholic Church, paternal charity compels us to regret with unfeigned sorrow. We are unhappily prevented from having the comfort of recognising them as brethren in the “household of faith;” if we cannot communicate with them in religious worship, “as sheep of the one fold;” as members of the “one faith,” it arises, on most occasions, from their refusing a credence to the doctrines of the Real Presence and Transubstantiation. In this instance, they too closely imitate the incredulity of those who withstood and disputed with Jesus Christ himself in person, upon this very article of belief, which his sacred lips delivered to them. In the same precise way with the Jews of old, with the self-same arguments, the very same expressions, our separated neighbours at the present day *protest* against this doctrine of Jesus. “They strive among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat?”* “They murmur at it, and exclaim, This is a hard saying; who can hear it?”† Instead of bringing their reason to a subjection to faith; instead of imitating the confiding piety of Simon Peter, who answered for himself and his brother apostles, “Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the word of eternal life;”‡ they emulate the incredulity of the first *protesters* against this doctrine; the first seceders from Christ Jesus; and “they go back, and walk no more with him.”§ They refuse their assent to a doctrine which he himself established.

* John vi. 52.
§ John vi. 66.

† John vi. 60-61.

‡ John vi. 68.

ART. XI.—*Summary Review of French Catholic Literature, From March to September, 1837.*

IN our Number for April, among the works which are enumerated, were several, not then complete, but coming out in numbers or volumes, published from time to time. These, it will not be necessary again to mention, unless some peculiar circumstances connected with their publication render it expedient. It will be sufficient to say, that the great collections of the Fathers, and of theological courses, continue to appear as we stated in our former article. Just before the expiration of the period to which our last summary reached, a new periodical appeared, which was overlooked in our list. We mean the *Revue Française et Etrangère*, undertaken by a company with a joint-stock capital of 100,000fr. The names of some of the editors, such as the Baron d'Eckstein, Ballanche, &c., give a ground of confidence in its principles, which has not been disappointed. The office is at 28, Rue des Grands-Augustins, Paris.

THEOLOGY.

Les Pères des trois premiers Siècles de l'Église. 12 vols. 8vo., 8fr. a volume. The first was to appear on the 1st of August, but has not yet been advertised as published.

Vérité Catholique, ou, Vue Générale de la Religion considérée dans son histoire et sa doctrine. Par M. Nault, ancien procureur général. This little work contains, in a compendious form, the Evidences of Christianity, as drawn from the study of man in his individual or in his social character. We have often been led to remark, the great superiority of continental writers over those of our own country, in the present age, upon this important part of theology. This is not the place to enter at length upon the comparison. The difference lies principally in this, that English writers chiefly occupy themselves with the external evidences, which assume more easily the form of a juridical, or, even a logical investigation, while foreigners lay more stress upon the proofs which result from the internal constitution of christianity, and its relations with the human mind and the moral wants of our nature. Such writers as Pascal and Schlegel, Bossuet and Stolberg, De Bonald and Windischmann, form a class of authors upon this subject, to which we have nothing to compare in English literature.

Le Christianisme considéré dans ses rapports avec la civilisation moderne. Par M. l'Abbé A. Sepac. 2 vols. 8vo. 15fr.

Paroles d'un croyant, par M. l'Abbé De la Mennais, quand il était un croyant, retrouvées mises en Italien d'après le manuscrit même de M. De la Mennais, et reproduites en Français d'après la traduction Italienne. Par un chanoine d'Aoste. 8vo. 2fr.

Réflexions sur la conduite à tenir dans le tribunal de la pénitence

par rapport aux Usuriers. Par un prêtre du Diocèse de Bayeux. 12mo. 2fr. 50c.

Manuel des Confesseurs. Par M. l'Abbé Gaume, chanoine de Nevers. 2 vols. 12mo. 5fr. or 8vo. 8fr. This is a useful and interesting work upon one of the most important duties of the Catholic ministry. It consists of tracts regarding it by St. Charles Borromeo, St. Francis de Sales, St. Philip Neri, and B. Alfonso Liguori.

Des Rapports qui existent entre les sciences et la religion, Discours prononcés en 1835 par Wiseman . . . avec Notes et Explications. 2 vols. 8vo. 16fr.

PHILOSOPHY.

Philosophie de la Vie, par Schlegel, traduite en Français. Par M. Guenot. 2 vols. 8vo. 14fr.

Philosophie de l'Histoire, par Schlegel, traduite en Français. Par M. l'Abbé Lechat. 2 vols. 8vo. 12fr. The character of these two works ought to be sufficiently known to our readers, that of the latter, from the admirable translation of it by Mr. Robertson; that of the former, by the analysis he has given of it in his valuable Introduction. We must regret that this has not been presented to the reader in a complete translation. The French, whom we are accustomed to undervalue as a light and superficial nation, especially in their scientific literature, allow no work of real value to appear beyond the Rhine, without immediately translating it into their own language. In our last notice, we mentioned a complete translation of the works of Stolberg. The *Symbolik* of Möhler, a work of far greater interest and use in our countries than in France, has been translated upwards of a year; and some other works of a similar character will be mentioned in the course of this Article.

Malebranche. 2 vols. 8vo., double columns, 24fr. The revolution which has taken place in the philosophical school of the Continent, and the complete rejection of the Lockian system, has replaced on the top of the wheel names, which, for a century, have been allowed to sink into neglect, and have too often been made objects of derision. Such is Malebranche, and we are not surprised that the French should wish to vindicate for their nation, by the publication of his works, its right to be considered the originator of systems which have been revived, in our times, as original and new. This republication of Malebranche, whose works in twelve volumes are now very scarce, is due to the indefatigable zeal and activity of M. Dè Genoude, proprietor of the *Gazette de France*.

Discours sur les avantages moraux de l'étude des sciences naturelles. Par M. l'Abbé Poullot . . . directeur de l'institution de Saint-Vincent, à Senlis. 8vo. 50c. This is a discourse pronounced on the 16th of August 1836, at a distribution of premiums at Goincourt near Beauvais. The author, who was then professor of theology in the seminary of Beauvais, has ever exerted himself to excite in his pupils an enthusiastic love of nature and of the physical sciences. It is chiefly in view to the moral cultivation which results from those pursuits that he treats of them in this discourse. He powerfully rebuts the idea, that they tend

to render boys pedantic or self-conceited; on the contrary, he shows how they are the fittest means for repressing vicious inclinations in youth, for producing a degree of modesty and distrust in themselves, inspiring a lofty idea of God and his attributes, and disposing the mind to receive revealed truths. The exhortation at the close is eloquent and pathetic. The *Temps*, a paper no ways suspected of partiality to the clergy, had an article a few weeks back, headed, "Improvement of Seminaries." It observes, that "courses of geology, experimental philosophy, and astronomy, are now opened at most of the seminaries of the kingdom;" . . . and that this new spirit "will be of immense advantage to them by increasing their acquirements, and furnishing them new means of solace in the solitude to which they are often condemned. The country priest who becomes a naturalist, will be more useful to his flock, and less a burden to himself." We have in fact noticed in the French papers, constant mention of such improvements in various ecclesiastical institutions: and would gladly see a similar extension given to natural studies in our own establishments for education.

BIOGRAPHY AND HISTORY.

Histoire de la Révolution religieuse, ou de la Réforme Protestante dans la Suisse occidentale. Par Ch. L. De Haller. 1 vol. 8vo. 5fr. The name of M. De Haller is well known to the English Catholic, as his account of his conversion was soon translated into our language, and excited universal sympathy among us. Having been, previous to that event, a member both of the supreme, and of the secret counsel of Berne, he has had every means of making himself acquainted with the religious history of his country: and in the volume just named, he has made a useful addition to the documents relating to the rise of Protestantism, by giving its particular history in the great focus of Calvinism. Zurich and Berne were the first places to receive the new doctrines, for they preceded Geneva in this lamentable step. The first declaration in its favour at the first of these cities, was in 1532, and M. De Haller's book treats of the interval between this date and 1550. The author is careful to quote on every point original authorities, above all suspicion. We hope, before long, to treat of this valuable work more at length.

Histoire abrégée et costumes coloriés de tous les Ordres religieux et militaires. This work is conducted by a society of ecclesiastics and laymen, who have taken for their ground-work the well-known history of Père Helyot. It is published in parts, each containing half a sheet of letter-press, and a coloured engraving, for 1fr. Each engraving contains three costumes, and the work will consist of 100 parts, forming two large 4to. volumes.

Histoire de la Papauté pendant les XVI^e et XVII^e Siècles, par Leopold Rank. Traduite de l'Allemand par M. Haibert, publiée et précédée d'une Introduction par M. A. de Saint-Chéron. Some delay has occurred in the publication of this work, in consequence of the publisher's wish, after having advertised the two first volumes as ready for publication, to complete the work by the translation of the two last

added by the author. Ranke's work has produced considerable sensation in Germany, and has been chiefly made known in England by two articles in the *Quarterly*. We hoped to have reviewed it at length in our present number; we will not, however, allow a long time to pass without discharging our duty towards it.

Histoire d'Angleterre, commençant 100 ans avant J.-C. et se terminant à la réforme de 1832. Par M. Hercule Gallard. 15 vols. 8vo. Publishing in parts, one of which forming half a volume, appears every twenty days, at the price of 3fr. 50c.

Continuation de l'Histoire d'Angleterre du Dr. Lingard depuis la Révolution de 1688, jusqu'à nos jours. 6 vols. 8vo. 6fr. 50c. a vol.

Collection d'Histoires complètes de tous les États Européens. Publiées sous les auspices de M. le Baron de Barante, M. Villemain, &c. . . . et avec la collaboration du docteur John Lingard, de MM. Botta, Luden, Ashbach, Leq. &c. This collection will form from twenty to twenty-five vols., large octavo, in two columns. Three numbers are published weekly.

Cours élémentaire et méthodique d'histoire universelle à l'usage des collèges, séminaires, pensionats, écoles chrétiennes, &c. Par M. l'Abbé Giraud. 9 vols. 18mo. 7fr. 50c. This work consists of three parts, each contained in three volumes, and treating respectively of ancient history, the middle ages, and modern history.

Manuel de l'Histoire du moyen âge. The author of this important work, M. Moeller, is professor in the Catholic University of Louvain. His book is eminently Catholic, and ever keeps in view the advantages which the Catholic Church has conferred upon society.

Vie et Lettres de Madame de Cadrieu, religieuse de l'ordre de Malte. We have here the life of one among the many thousands, who have done honour to our holy religion by their saintly life and conversation, yet have been little known save to God, and the few friends who surrounded them. Before the French revolution, the Nuns Hospitallers had a large establishment at Saint-Dolus. To the usual vows, they added, that of praying for the success of the Knights of St. John, in the warlike enterprises. Their dress was white until the capture of Rhodes, when, in sign of mourning it was changed to black. In this house, Madame de Cadrien exercised every office of Christian charity, from the age of twenty to twenty-seven, when she died in 1730. Before entering into the religious state, she had been obliged to pass through the usual preparations which God requires of such as he calls to extraordinary perfection, by the sacrifice of wealth, and brilliant prospects in the world. What makes this biography particularly valuable is, not only that it is drawn up from original documents, which, till now, have lain in obscurity, but that it consists in great measure of letters written by the lady whose biography it contains. These are full of the most exalted sentiments of Catholic devotion, expressed in language at once noble, poetical, and original.

Abrégé de la Vie de Jésus-Christ, de ses doctrines et de ses miracles. Par A. J. Delage. 1 vol. 12mo. plats, 1 fr. 50c.

Vie des Saints de la Bretagne, par D. Lobineau, nouvelle édition,

revue, &c. Par M. l'Abbé Tresvaux. The work, when complete, to consist of five or six volumes, 5fr. a volume. The country of Brittany seems ever to have been a fit theatre for great and romantic actions. Its worship before its conversion to Christianity, the piety of its first Christians, its noble deeds during the middle ages, and its heroism in our own times, have all a strong character analogous to the physical qualities of the country itself—"a land of granite covered with oaks." The lives of its saints were first collected together, often from traditional sources by Father Legrand, at the close of the sixteenth century. His work breathes all the charming spirit of the hagiography of his age, simplicity of style, purity of faith, and unaffected piety. Dom Lobineau, a Maurist monk, went over the same ground a century later; but unhappily that century had made sad havoc with the qualities we have enumerated as distinguishing that of his predecessor. Lobineau was infected with the Jansenism of his times, he wrote as a critic: whatever was mystical or *legendary*, he rejected with disdain, and thus, he compiled one of those dry rationalist biographies, of which we have had too many examples in our own and other languages. M. Tresvaux has happily undertaken the task of remodelling his work, chiefly by the aid of Legrand's earlier work, and also from the chronicles of England, Ireland, and Scotland, in which the best accounts of Breton saints, are to be found. By this means, he has produced a work, in which their lives will be restored to that charming form in which they originally appeared, corrected by modern critical refinement.

L'Église primatiale de Saint-Jean et son chapitre, Esquisse historique. Par M. l'Abbé Jacques. Lyon. Octavo. Lyons has lately been distinguished by a spirit of antiquarian investigation into the history of its sacred monuments. The Abbé Pavy is at the head of this study, and the author of the "two chancellors of England" has been indebted to him for important particulars connected with the life of our great St. Thomas. The work we have named, is part of a larger one intended to illustrate the diocese of Lyons. It treats of the magnificent cathedral of that city, one of the most solemn and magnificent pointed churches in the world.

The Society "de l'Histoire de France," has been engaged in publishing the works of St. Gregory of Tours.

LITERATURE, POETRY, AND WORKS OF FICTION.

Études sur les Mystères, monumens historiques littéraires, la plupart inconnus, et sur divers manuscrits, de Gerson, y compris le texte primitif Français de l'Imitation de J. C. récemment découvert, avec le nom de son auteur. Par M. Onésime Leroy. 1 vol. 8vo. 7fr. 50c. The author of this valuable work, is one of that "Jeune France," which forms the true hope of its country, overflowing with a fine healthy spirit in literature, not only purged of all the wretched taste of the last century, but inspired with fervent admiration for ages long past. The mysteries of the middle ages, the true drama of the Christian religion, though often mentioned, are but little known. M. Leroy has devoted himself to the study of them as yet existing in manuscript, and has communicated the result of his researches, under the modest title we

have given. The oldest of these compositions which has come to his knowledge, is "*Le jus (le jeu) de S. Nichole*," written in 1260, on occasion, as he shews it probable, of St. Louis's expedition to Africa. A century later, we have a collection of seven pieces, entitled, *Mystères de Notre-Dame*, drawn chiefly from events in French history. In all these, there is great regularity and art, and a fine flow of simple religious poetry. The great master-piece, however, of those times, is the drama of the Passion, which embraces the whole history of redemption. Some scenes quoted and analysed by our author, will stand comparison with the noblest passages in *Athalie*. We expect a rich treat in this department of literature from M. Rio's work on Christian poetry. Mysteries are still kept up in some parts of France; and a remarkable instance of them lately occurred with extraordinary pomp at Dunkirk. The mysteries of Calderon are known to all the lovers of Spanish literature: his solemn and splendid drama, "*Devotion to the Cross*," was translated into German by Schlegel.—The second part of M. Leroy's work will be interesting to every lover of sacred bibliography. The book which stands first of all uninspired volumes, is claimed for Gerson, and M. Leroy thinks he has discovered in his native city, Valenciennes, the chancellor's original *French* manuscript. According to him, the work was first written in three books, and in the vernacular tongue, for the use of Gerson's sisters at Rheims, and afterwards recomposed in four, for the Celestines of Lyons.

Histoires morales et édifiantes. Par Madame J. Junot d'Abrantès. 2 vols. 8fr. These beautiful tales, published by the *Société des publications religieuses*, are intended to guide the minds of children to a love of virtue, and do infinite honour to the abilities and the moral feeling of their distinguished authoress.

Prascovie, ou la piété filiale, &c. This and three or four other little works are advertised to appear at the end of this month, (September), and we mention them as specimens of the indefatigable zeal which prompts the *Société Bibliographique* to continue the publication of simple yet beautiful works for the instruction of tender youth. The same works as it has published, we see advertised by the *Société de Saint-Nicolas*, the origin of which is very recent. About ten years ago, the Abbé de Bervanger and Count Victor de Noailles, opened an establishment for the education of orphans from the age of eight to twelve, when they made their first communion, and then gave place to others. The separation at so tender an age was painful to masters and pupils, as the first saw temptation, and the last misery, in the first step so early into life. Hence, it was proposed, to connect some useful trade with the institution, by which future means of livelihood should be secured to the pupils, who should likewise receive occupation in the house for some years longer. A printing-office was chosen, as the young labourers could thus be beneficial to society at large, by the publication of useful works. The Society of St. Nicholas was thus established, funds were raised, the printing establishment of Didot, jun., has been purchased, and the undertaking has been placed under the direction of religious, practised in the art of printing. One of the chief

administrators, has been for years at the head of one of the most flourishing printing-offices in Paris, and had a considerable share in it; but has given up all to devote himself to this charitable work. The Comte de Noailles died July 22, of this year, after having brought this excellent plan into activity. The first work printed by the pupils, has been the *Histoires et Paraboles* du P. Bonaventure Gireaudau.

Poésies par Jean Reboul de Nîmes. Third edition. The poet is a poor man, who has sought consolation for the ills of life in his religion, and inspired by it alone, has poured forth his gratitude in verses full of pathos, energy, and approaching sometimes almost to the sublime. "Oh, my God!" he exclaims, "if I had not possessed poetry to give utterance to my complaint, and religion to console me, what would have become of me!" We would gladly quote one or two of the many beautiful passages in this volume, particularly his poem addressed to Our Saviour, did space permit.

A. M. de la Mennais Deux Epîtres. Par Désiré Carrière. 8v. 1fr. 50c. Another youthful poet, full of genius and nerve, superiorly skilled in the use of his own language, who comes forward to vindicate his religion from the attacks of the unfortunate De la Mennais. The first epistle confutes the *Paroles d'un Croyant*, the second the *Affaires de Rome*. In both, but principally in the latter, there prevails a tone of noble indignation, tempered with deep compassion for the once great name to whom they are addressed. M. Carrière, we believe, intends to do poetical justice upon another who has fallen away from his first faith, by the publication of a *Jecelyn Chrétien*.

Léa Cornélia. Par Anna Maria, auteur de *l'Ame exilée*.—*Sard, ou les heureux effets d'une éducation Chrétienne.* Par l'auteur de *Sidonie*, &c. 2 vols. 12mo. 7fr. These two works by female hands, deserve to be classed together, as much from their subjects, as from the ability and pure religious spirit which they display. The first of them is intended to prove, that an education conducted upon mere philosophical principles, without a firm religious ground-work, prepares the way for a life of misery. The moral of the two is nearly the same.

Faut-il abolir l'esclavage? La religion Catholique peut seule préparer les esclaves à la liberté, et les faire jouir de ses bienfaits. Par M. l'Abbé J. Hardy. 1fr 15c.

Encyclopédie des Connaissances Utiles. A number in 18mo., of four hundred pages, appears every twenty days. 1fr. 20c. a volume. To recommend this work, it is sufficient to see the list of contributors. Only looking at the first letters of the alphabet, we find the geographical articles by Balbi, the articles *Ame* and *Atheisme* by Ballanche, *Cosmogonie* and *Creation* by Baron d'Ekstein, *Consoles* and *Conclave* by Abbé Badiche. We are thus assured of the Catholic spirit of the work.

Encyclopédie du XIX Siècle, 4to 7fr. a volume. The preface of this work, consisting of M. Laurentie's *Théorie Catholique des Sciences*, is a sufficient security for its principles.

We may here notice the series of publications under the title of *Maître Jacques*, each at seven sous. Two works come out a week; and the entire collection is pervaded by a sound religious spirit.

WORKS OF DEVOTION.

Opusculs de Drexelius. The works of this learned and pious Jesuit, will now be rescued from the oblivion in which the last and present centuries have left them, though, in better times, it is calculated, that 170,000 copies of them had been sold. This new edition faithfully copied, even to the ornamental title-pages of the older ones, will be a valuable addition to the library of every Catholic who knows how to appreciate the simple and moving style of the old spiritual masters. The price of each volume is 1fr.

Les vertus évangéliques, ou Conseils à Théodonie. Second edition, 1 vol. 18mo., 1fr. This excellent little book of instructions has reached its second edition in eighteen months.

La Douloureuse Passion de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ, d'après les méditations d'Anne-Catherine Emmerich . . . morte en 1814, traduite de l'allemand sur la deuxième édition. Par M. Ed. de Cazalès. Second edition, 1 vol. 8vo. 7fr. The abridgment in 12mo. 80 cent. Sister Emmerich was a nun at Dülmen, who, like many others in that holy calling, had been compelled to leave her peaceful retreat. Blessed with a spirit of divine contemplation, she was able to describe the scenes of Our Saviour's life and passion with a vividness and richness which no poetical inspiration has ever equalled. Her descriptions were taken down in writing by Clement Brentans, one of the first poets, if not quite the first living poet of Germany. He confined his publication, however, to the history of the passion, to which he added, in a second edition, which his work soon reached, her narrative of the institution of the Blessed Eucharist. The French translation has met with as favourable a reception as the original had obtained in Germany.

Lyre sainte de la Jeunesse Chrétienne, ou petit Recueil de Cantiques, à l'usage des pensions, &c. 1 vol. 12mo. 1 fr. 25c.

Le petit Jardin des Roses, et la Vallée des Lys, opusculs du B. Thomas à Kempis. 1 vol. 12m. 1fr.

Anthologie Catholique, ou Instructions dogmatiques et morales sur les vérités de la religion. Par l'Abbé Huet. 1 vol. 12mo. 2fr. 25c. This complete course of religious instruction, has the sanction and approbation of His Grace the Archbishop of Paris.

MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE.

THE CHOLERA.—*Rome, Oct. 3.* The cholera may be said to have now accomplished its frightful visitation of the Eternal City. Its course has been rapid but appalling; from the middle of August to the end of September, upwards of 12,000, some say 14,000, victims have been swept away. A noble field has thus been opened for the exercise of Catholic virtue, and we need not say that both the parochial and the regular clergy have done their duty. The curates or parish priests of St. Peter's and St. Charles's, and the sub-curates of two other

churches, fell early in the exercise of their duty. Among the regulars, it might be invidious to make any distinction where so many deserve praise, but the self-devotion of the Jesuits will not easily be forgotten. This zealous and active charity was not confined to the clergy, and all Rome has had occasion to admire the intrepidity and benevolence with which a noble Catholic Peer has laboured to assuage the sufferings of the poorest class. The various communities of British and Irish Catholics have, by God's blessing, escaped the scourge, with the exception of one not fatal case. One English sculptor of great promise, Mr. Burlow, and an English lady, Mrs. Vaughan, have been the only British subjects who have suffered. Another gentleman fell a victim to the momentary fury of the populace; but he was the first and the last that was attacked in such a manner.

WEYMOUTH.—The Rev. Dr. Butler, Catholic pastor of this town, has lately delivered a series of lectures on the principal controverted points of the Catholic faith, proving the truths of our holy religion from Scripture alone. These discourses were attended by crowded audiences, and such has been the interest excited by them, that the learned Doctor has been induced to send his lectures to the press, and which accordingly are now in the course of publication every alternate Saturday.

CATHOLIC DIRECTORY AND REGISTER.—A new annual, called the "Catholic Directory and Annual Register," has been announced for publication early in December, which will embrace a variety of statistical details, including lists of all the Catholic chapels and their incumbents in Great Britain, and complete diocesan lists of all the parishes, chapels, parish-priests, and curates in Ireland, furnished in most cases by the Catholic Bishops of Ireland expressly for the work.

DIRECTIONS FOR MAKING A WILL.—(The following document has been circulated from the office of Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Home Department, among the clergy, and calls for the attention of the public.) "Directions for making a Will or Codicil, required by Stat. 1 Victoria, c. 26, § 9, to be observed after the end of the year 1837. 1. The will or codicil must be signed at the foot or end thereof by the testator. 2. If he does not sign, it must be signed by some other person in his presence, and by his direction. 3. The signature must be made, or acknowledged, by the testator, in the presence of two or more witnesses present at the same time. 4. The witnesses must attest and subscribe the will or codicil in the presence of the testator.—*Principal Regulations for amending the Laws of Wills, which will take effect on the 1st Day of 1838.*—No will made by any person under the age of 21 years will be valid. (Sect. 7.) The new statute does not alter the law as to the wills of married women. (Sect. 8.)—The regulations to be observed in making a will or codicil are as follows:—1. The will or codicil must be signed at the foot or end thereof by the testator. 2. If he does not sign, it must be signed by some other person in his presence, and by his direction. 3. The signature must be made, or acknowledged, by the testator, in the presence of two or more witnesses

present at the same time. 4. The witnesses must attest and subscribe the will or codicil in the presence of the testator. (Sect. 9.)—Appointments by will, under a power, are made subject to the above-mentioned regulations. (Sect. 10.) The testator's marriage is a revocation of this will, excepting in certain cases of exercise of powers. (Sect. 18.)—The revocation of a will or codicil may be by any one of the following means:—1 By a will or codicil executed in the manner above-mentioned. 2. By a writing declaring the intent to revoke, and executed as a will. 3. By burning, tearing, or destroying of the will by the testator, with intent to revoke, or by some person in his presence, and by his direction. (Sect. 20.)—Alterations made in wills must be executed in like manner as wills. N.B. The signature of the testator and subscription of witnesses may be made in the margin, or opposite, or near to, the alteration, or at the end of a memorandum, on the will, referring to the alteration. (Sect. 21.) Residuary devises in wills will include (unless a contrary intention appear in the will) estates comprised in lapsed or void devises. (Sect. 25.)

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL v. TODD.

Ursula Mountney by her will, dated the 16th of July 1680, gave to Ralph Clavering and his heirs, an annuity or rent-charge of 32*l.* issuing out of her lands therein described, and subject to the annuity, she gave the lands to William Lord Widderington and his heirs.

By a paper of instructions, dated the 21st of August 1680, after reciting the gift of the rent-charge, she proceeded as follows:—"Whereas, by reason of the malignancy of the times, I could not, by my last will, declare the use or uses to which I intended the said sum of 32*l.* per annum should be disposed, I did therefore give and bequeath the same to the said Ralph Clavering and his heirs; yet, nevertheless, my said devise was and is, and I do hereby declare the same to be upon special trust, and to the intent and purpose only, that the money arising and growing due and payable by virtue of the rent-charge granted to Ralph Clavering and his heirs, by my said last will and testament, shall be disposed of by this my writing under my hand and seal, I shall hereafter nominate and appoint. *Imprimis*, I do request and desire my honourable friend and kinsman, William Lord Widderington, that Stonecroft Numbush with the appurtenances may always be let to farm to some deserving Catholic, qualified to entertain a priest for the help of poor Catholics in Hexham and Warden parishes, and other places near adjacent. And whereas my dear brother, Mr. John Widderington, late deceased, did, by his last will, order and appoint that a Dominican or Franciscan priest should be kept at Stonecroft, I do hereby order and desire that the same may be performed accordingly, if a priest of any such order can be conveniently had. And I do give 20*l.* per annum to the priest that shall serve at Stonecroft for his maintenance, to be paid yearly out of the aforesaid rent-charge of 32*l.* per annum, at such feasts and days of payment as the same shall become due and payable by virtue of my said will. And for the residue of the aforesaid sum of 32*l.* per annum, I do hereby order the same to be disposed of as followeth; namely,

I do give 3*l*. a year to the poor of Warden parish ; 3*l*. a year to the poor of Hexham parish ; 40*s*. a year to the poor of Collerton parish ; 20*s*. a year to the poor of St. John Lee parish ; 20*s*. a year to the poor of the Cornridge parish, to be paid yearly and for ever at such feasts or days as by my trustees hereinafter nominated and appointed to receive the same, shall be thought fit and convenient. And I do give 40*s*. a year for ever unto such person or persons as shall be employed to receive and distribute the 10*l*. a year to the poor of the several parishes above-mentioned, for their labour and expenses in and about the receiving and distributing thereof."

In the year 1693 William Lord Widdrington, the devisee of Ursula Mountney, conveyed the Stonecroft estate, subject to the rent-charge of 32*l*., to Thomas Gibson and his heirs ; and Thomas Gibson and his heirs covenanted that he and they would pay the annuity of 32*l*. to the heirs and assigns of Ralph Clavering.

The Stonecroft estate continued in the possession of Thomas Gibson and his family till 1816, when Jasper Gibson, the then owner, conveyed it to trustees for sale. It was put up for sale in June 1822, and in the particulars and conditions of sale, was described to be subject to a rent-charge of 32*l*. a year, and John Todd became the purchaser, subject to those conditions.

Up to the time of this purchase, it was stated that the 10*l*. a year had been duly paid to the poor of the parishes named in the paper.

John Todd died on the 22d of September 1830, having devised the estate to William Todd, and made William Todd and Nicholas Todd his executors ; and, on the 15th August 1830, Edward Clavering, the heir of Ralph Clavering, the devisee of the rent-charge, conveyed and assigned the rent-charge to Nicholas Leadbitter.

The original information was filed *ex officio* by the Attorney-General on the 5th of September 1831, against William Todd and Nicholas Todd, and against Edward Clavering, in whom the rent-charge was supposed to be vested ; but, it appearing that the rent-charge had been assigned to Leadbitter, the information was amended on the 11th of January 1833, by substituting Leadbitter as a party defendant for Edward Clavering.

The information prayed that the charity therein mentioned might be established, and that it might be declared that the sum of 20*l*. per annum, part of the rent-charge of 32*l*. per annum, was vested in his Majesty, and by his consent applicable to the purposes of the said charity, or otherwise at his Majesty's disposal by his sign manual ; and that an account might be taken of the rent-charge of 32*l*. per annum, and that, if necessary, a reference might be directed to the Master to approve of a scheme for the regulation of the charity.

The Defendants William Todd and Nicholas Todd, by their answer, admitted that John Todd paid some arrears of 10*l*. a year given to the poor, but refused to make payment of the 20*l*. a year, insisting, as the Defendants then insisted, that the rent-charge of 32*l*. was, by the will of the testatrix, charged on Stonecroft jointly with other estates, and that the Stonecroft estate was chargeable only with a proportional part of the rent-charge. And they said, that if it should appear upon production of the paper of instructions, or any deed for establishing the charity or otherwise, that William Lord Widdrington lawfully charged the Stonecroft estate with the whole of the rent-charge of 32*l*. in exoneration of the other estates charged therewith by the will, they were ready and willing to account for the same, and in all respects to act in the premises in such manner as the Court should direct.

The Defendant Leadbitter submitted by his answer, that the annual sum of 20*l.* part of the rent-charge of 32*l.*, was payable to such Roman Catholic priest as was mentioned or provided for in the paper of instructions signed by the testatrix. It was proved, by production of deeds, dated in the month of May 1693, that William Lord Widderington charged the Stonecroft estate exclusively with the payment of the rent-charge of 32*l.* a year.

Mr. Kindersley and Mr. Heberden, in support of the information, said that as this information was filed before the passing of the act 2 & 3 W. 4. c. 115, it was clear that that act could have no application; that the gift for the support of a Roman Catholic priest, being a gift for promoting a religion contrary to the established one, was void, but being in the nature of a charitable gift for a religious purpose, which could not be distinguished from a charitable purpose, it devolved upon the Crown to direct its application to a *cypres* charitable purpose by its sign manual directed to the Attorney-General: *Attorney-General v. Baxter*, *Attorney-General v. Guise*, *De Costa v. De Paz*, *Cary v. Abbot*.

Mr. Lynch, for the Defendant Leadbitter.

In the case of *West v. Shuttleworth*, it was decided that a bequest to promote the knowledge of the Roman Catholic religion was a valid bequest; and in *Bradshaw v. Tasker*, it was held that the act of the 2 & 3 W. 4. c. 115, which puts persons professing the Roman Catholic religion upon the same footing, with respect to their schools, places for religious worship, education and charitable purposes, as Protestant Dissenters, was retrospective. The third section of that act provides that nothing contained in it shall affect any suit actually pending or commenced, or any property then in litigation, discussion, or dispute, in any court of law or equity. It is true that this suit was commenced before the passing of the act, but Leadbitter was not made a Defendant until July 1833, which was after the act had passed, and so far as his interest is concerned, which indeed involves the whole matter in dispute, there was no pending litigation until after the act of the 2 & 3 W. 4. c. 115, came into operation. If a bequest for the propagation of the Roman Catholic religion be good—and this cannot now be disputed—it seems impossible to contend that a bequest for the maintenance and support of a Roman Catholic priest can be unlawful, for the promotion of the religion being a lawful object, the encouragement and support of the priests, by whom that religion is to be taught, must be equally lawful. In *Cary v. Abbot*, Sir W. Grant, though he decided that a bequest for educating children in the Roman Catholic faith was void—a decision which, even at that time, may be considered as doubtful—made a most important concession for the purposes of the present argument, and that was, that there was no statute making superstitious uses void generally, the statute of 1 Ed. 6. c. 14, relating only to superstitious uses of a particular description then existing. The devise in the present case does not fall within any of the particular superstitious uses declared to be void either by the statute of Henry 8, or by the statute of Ed. 6; and, although it would undoubtedly have fallen within the provisions made by the severe penal laws which were afterwards enacted against Roman Catholics, yet, as all those penal laws have been repealed, and as Roman Catholics are put upon a complete equality with Protestant Dissenters in respect to their religious worship, a bequest for the support of a Roman Catholic priest is no longer contrary to the policy of the law. In the *Attorney-General v. Pearson*, Lord Eldon said that a trust for maintaining a society of Protestant Dissenters, holding doctrines not contrary to law, though at variance with the doctrines of the Established Church, was a trust which it would be the duty of a court of equity to carry into execution. And as Roman Catholics now stand, with

reference to their rights in respect of religious worship, exactly in the same situation as Protestant Dissenters, there can be no doubt that it is equally the duty of this Court to carry into execution a trust which has for its object the promotion of the Roman Catholic religion. In *De Costa v. De Paz*, Lord Hardwicke decided that a bequest for propagating the Jewish religion was unlawful, but that decision went upon a principle which does not apply to a bequest for the promotion of the Roman Catholic religion, namely, that the intent of the bequest was in contradiction to the Christian religion, which is part and parcel of the law of the land. The Roman Catholics and the members of the established religion go together to a certain point: both profess Christianity, and, in this respect, the doctrines of both are equally consistent with the policy of the law. In *West v. Shuttleworth*, the present Lord Chancellor, when Master of the Rolls, held a bequest to Roman Catholic priests, that the testatrix might have the benefit of their prayers for the repose of her soul, to be void, as falling within the meaning, though not within the letter, of the superstitious uses intended to be suppressed by the statute of 1 Ed. 6. No such condition is here annexed to the bequest, nor can the testatrix be presumed to have had any other design in creating this trust for the support of a Roman Catholic priest, than the pious purpose of promoting the religion which she professed, a purpose which would now not only be lawful, but which a court of equity would be bound to see executed, and to which, by the act of the 2 & 3 W. 4. c. 115, the operation of which Lord Brougham has declared to be retrospective, this Court is enabled to give effect.

Mr. Pemberton and Mr. Wray, for the executors of Told.

The executors have themselves no interest in the subject of this discussion, further than that, if this gift was a fraud upon the law, and consequently void, it is their duty to contend that it ought not to be applied to the unlawful object contemplated by the testatrix. If this gift was in the year 1680 null and void, and if the testatrix herself was so conscious of its illegality that she resorted to a secret declaration of trust with a view to accomplish her unlawful purpose, it is a strange proposition to say that an act passed in the year 1832 shall have the effect of reviving it. According to this doctrine, every superstitious use which the law has declared void, every devise or trust which by statute or otherwise has been declared to be contrary to the policy of the law and therefore void, would be set up and revived by the supposed retrospective operation of the 2 & 3 W. 4. c. 115. There is nothing in that act from which it can be inferred that it was the intention of the legislature to give it a retrospective operation; no reason was assigned for the decision in *Bradshaw v. Tasker*, and the case does not appear to have been argued. The act of the 2 & 3 W. 4. c. 115, contains a special provision that nothing contained in it shall affect any suit then pending, or any property which was then the subject of litigation, discussion, or dispute, in any court of law or equity; and yet it is supposed that, by this very act, it was intended to re-open questions through an indefinite period of time, and to give validity to gifts which the law had for centuries declared to be illegal. When a person grants or devises an estate and makes a declaration of trust by the same or a different instrument for a purpose which is illegal, and which, in this case, the person declaring the trust knew to be illegal, the grantee or devisee will either take the estate discharged from the trust, or there will be a resulting trust for the donor, or testator, and the estate will go to the heir-at-law. In this case there is nothing in the unlawful declaration of trust which can possibly be converted into a charitable purpose. In *De Thérmines v. De Bonneval*, a person gave to trustees a sum of stock to be applied in promoting the circulation of a parti-

cular treatise inculcating the supremacy of the Pope, and the deed contained a proviso that if the trust should be declared void, the trustees should hold the stock in trust for the grantor's executors and administrators. In that case the Court held that the trust had no impress of charity upon it, and was consequently not applicable to any charitable purpose, and that, as the particular purpose failed by reason of its illegality, the stock reverted to the grantor. Applying that principle to the present case, as there is no impress of charity upon the gift, the purchaser John Todd, and his representatives, would take the estate discharged from the illegal trust.

Mr. Kindersley, in reply.

- The object of the testatrix was clearly charitable, though the mode in which she attempted to accomplish that object was illegal; and it devolves upon the Crown, therefore, to give effect to her charitable intentions *cypres*. Todd purchased the estate expressly subject to the trust; and there is no pretence, therefore, for contending that he, or those who claim under him, can take the estate discharged from the trust.

THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS.

Upon consideration of the paper of instructions I think that the purpose of the testatrix in providing for the priest that was to serve at Stonecroft for ever was charitable, her intention being that such priest should be a help to poor Catholics.

The intention being charitable, was the proposed mode of carrying that intention into effect legal? Before the statute 2 & 3 W. 4. c. 115, there could, I apprehend, be no doubt that the proposed mode of carrying the charitable intention into effect was illegal, and the Crown would have been entitled, under the King's sign manual, to direct the application of the fund to other charities in a legal mode.

Has, then, the statute I have mentioned any operation in this case? The information was filed on the 5th of September 1831, against the persons in whom the property subject to the charge was vested, and against Edward Clavering, in whom it was alleged the rent-charge was vested. The Todds put in their answer in March 1832, and stated their belief that the rent-charge was vested in Edward Clavering, which it had been, but was not at the time. The stat. 2 & 3 W. 4. c. 115, received the royal assent on the 16th of August 1832. The information was amended, and Leadbitter made a party in January 1833, and he answered in June in the same year.

The third section of the statute enacts that nothing therein contained shall affect any suit actually pending or commenced, or any property then in litigation, discussion, or dispute, in any of his Majesty's courts of law or equity in Great Britain.

And although Mr. Leadbitter was, under a mistake, not made a party to this information, when filed before the statute, it is impossible for me to consider that this suit was not commenced, and that this rent-charge as against the property charged with it, and the persons liable to pay it, was not in litigation, discussion, and dispute at the time when the statute was passed, and I am therefore of opinion that the case must be determined, as if that act had not passed; and looking to that which I consider to be the established practice of this Court in cases where the purpose is charitable, but the mode of effecting it illegal, I am of opinion that it devolves upon the Crown to state to what charitable purpose the £20 a year is to be applied.

Mr. John Todd purchased the estate with full knowledge of the charge in 1822, and from that time appears to have refused to pay it; but I think that

his estate, and the persons who have possessed the property since his death, ought to be charged with the rent-charge from the time of his purchase.

Declare that the direction to pay £20 a year to maintain a priest to serve at Stonecroft was illegal and void, but that the sum of £20 a year was given for a charitable purpose, and that the same ought to be applied to some other charitable use; and that the appointment and direction of such other charitable use is in the Crown, and the Court recommends the Attorney-General to apply to the King for a sign manual to appoint and direct to what charitable use or uses the annual sum of £20, part of the said rent-charge of £32, and the arrears, shall be applied.

Take an account from the time of the purchase by John Todd: the costs of the informant as between party and party to be paid by the Todds; the costs of the trustee Leadbitter, and the extra costs of the informant, to be paid out of the arrears.

END OF VOL. III.

ERRATA IN VOL. III.

- Line 3, from top of page 4, for *instructive* read *instinctive*.
- 1, at top of page 8, for *head* read *hand*.
- 16, from top of page 9, for *imitation* read *invitation*.
- 10, from bottom of text, page 13, for *which* read *what*.
- 13, from top of page 46, for *protect* read *protect it*.
- 4, from bottom of text, page 57, for *Protestantism* read *protestation*.
- 2, of note, page 71, for *another* read *the mother*.
- 21, from top of page 74, for *her* read *other*.
- 15, from bottom of page 78, for *fields, preaching* read *field-preachings*.
- 16, from bottom of page 161, for *Heekius* read *Heckius*.
- 12, from bottom of text, page 279, for *lungs* read *liver*.

